This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

+ *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
+ *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
+ *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
+ *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at `http://books.google.com/`

UNIVERSAL SUFFRAGE

VE RI TAS
HARVARD
COLLEGE
LIBRARY

Vel
BIND + Cat.

UNIVERSAL SUFFRAGE.

FEMALE SUFFRAG

BY

A REPUBLICAN.
(NOT A "RADICAL.")

"It is a misfortune, inseparable from human affairs, that public mea
are rarely investigated with that spirit of moderation which is essentia
just estimate of their real tendency to advance, or obstruct, the public
and that this spirit is more apt to be diminished than promoted by those
sions which require an unusual exercise of it."

MR. MADISON, in No. 37 of *The Federali*

PHILADELPHIA:
J. B. LIPPINCOTT & CO.
1867.

Soc 5060.2

UNIVERSAL SUFFRAGE.

I DESIRE to lay before my fellow-citizens in the following pages some reasons why the suffrage should be qualified and not unqualified and universal. On men who are merely partisans, I know well that all reasoning is wasted.

> "The retail politician's anxious thought
> Deems this side always right, and that stark naught;
> He foams with censure; with applause he raves;
> A dupe to rumors, and a tool of knaves;
> He'll want no type his weakness to proclaim,
> While such a thing as foolscap has a name."*

Upon men of this character I can hope to make no impression. But I address myself to that large class of moderate and intelligent thinkers who hold their allegiance to any party very lightly, and who are always ready, by throwing their weight from one side to the other, to prevent the legislation of the country from running into foolish and fanatical extremes.

While the mere partisan is always fearful of hear-

* From "Paper—A Conversational Pleasantry"—generally attributed to Franklin, but also credited to Hopkinson.

ing both sides of a question, he whose desire is above all to attain the truth, never feels certain of his opinions until he has heard, and fairly weighed, all that can be said in opposition to them. As that independent and profound thinker, John Stuart Mill, says: "No wise man ever acquired his wisdom in any mode but this; nor is it in the nature of the human intellect to become wise in any other manner." And as the present writer has read, and, as far as possible, impartially considered everything that he could find in opposition to his own views relative to the suffrage, he feels that he has some "right to think his judgment better than that of any person or any multitude *who have not gone through a similar process.*"

In considering the arguments principally relied upon by those who are in favor of making the suffrage universal, they will be found to be generally connected with the supposition that the right to vote is a natural right. Even when this idea is not expressly contended for, the arguments used often derive all their vitality from this root. It will be necessary, therefore, to consider this question of natural right, which lies at the very foundation of so much of the argument.

"Governments derive their Just Powers from the Consent of the Governed."

In the first place it is said, borrowing the language of the Declaration of Independence, that governments "derive their just powers from the consent of the governed;" and, *therefore*, every person—as some urge, even without regard to sex—has a right to vote.

The logic of this is not very accurate. Let me illustrate. We have a government in this country. The great mass of the people, men, women, and children, "consent" to this government. Not only do they "consent" to it for themselves in these Northern States, but they have such a high opinion of it that they have just gone through a long and bloody war to *force* some millions of others to "*consent*" to it likewise. Certainly, therefore, we may assume it to be a fact that all of us "consent" to this government; all the North of their own free will, the greater portion of the South because they have been thrashed into *consenting*. Now, under this government, only a few negroes, and no women or children, have been allowed to vote. Does not this prove, by the very nearest illustration possible, that a people may "consent" to a government, which government does not allow them to vote? And if their "consent" be the proper basis from which the just powers of the government are derived, any government to which they "consent" is a rightful government, without regard to its peculiar character, or as to whether it is even republican at all? Why, the present government of France, sanctioned by a very large majority of the people of France, and which undoubtedly exists with the "consent" of the greater portion of the governed, is an almost absolute mon-

archy.* To attempt to deduce, therefore, the right of every man, and more, every woman, to vote, from the general phrase made use of in the Declaration of Independence, is simply absurd. Our fathers laid down this principle as a proper basis for a certain contemplated action,—the throwing off of a foreign and tyrannical rule. They did not "consent" to be any longer the colonies of Great Britain. The principle in question would have been just as appropriate if they had designed setting up a limited monarchy of their own. They simply asserted in their famous Declaration that the rule of England had become despotic, and such as Englishmen at home were not expected to submit to, and therefore maintained their right to rebel, and to institute a new government, "laying its foundations *on such* principles, and organizing its powers in *such* forms *as to them seemed most likely to effect their safety and happiness.*"

Governments "derive their just powers from the consent of the governed." Undoubtedly this is a truth; or, more properly, one view of the truth as it pertains to government. But it is not the only aspect of the truth, the only true principle in the world. If it were, by what authority do you compel the Southern people to remain in the Union? Supposing they should take a vote in their different

* And be it remembered that when the Republicans of France, in their last revolution, proclaimed universal suffrage, they simply reared the ladder by which Louis Napoleon mounted first to the plain platform of the Presidency, and from thence to the gorgeous purple of an imperial throne.

States—allowing all to vote, men, women, and children, whites, blacks, and mulattoes—and that a majority in certain States, or in all, should not "consent" to remain in the Union, will you let them peaceably withdraw? If you will not, you acknowledge either that you are false to your own principle, or that there are other principles and considerations even more important than the "consent" of the governed.

Let us consider this principle from another point of view, and in connection with another principle also often referred to, that "taxation without representation is tyranny." And I may ask, in passing, do you believe this principle also as applied to Southern white men? If it is the only true principle in the world, and there is nothing more important to limit it, you are violating your principle every day that you keep the representatives of the Southern States out of Congress.

Governments "derive their just powers from the consent of the governed;" but does that mean what the Declaration of Independence does not say, the consent of the *majority* of the governed? Have the minority no rights? And does their mere voting necessarily imply "consent?" If I am in the minority, and vote persistently for years against a certain set of men and measures, which I think are ruining the country, am I showing my "consent" by voting against them? And are the men who obtain office in spite of my vote and earnest opposition, and whom I may despise and detest, in any

fair sense, in any other than a mere technical sense, my representatives?

Let us consider again a few facts in illustration. A very large proportion of the people of these Northern States were originally opposed to the war against the South. If they could have obtained the power, they would have made peace at almost any moment. And yet this large minority were for four years heavily taxed, and were drafted, and thus compelled to fight by themselves or a substitute, in a cause which they disapproved. I am not arguing against the right of the Administration and of Congress to force them to do this, I am only asking how much "*consent*" that minority gave to these things, and how far they were *represented* in the government which they were taxed, and made to fight in person or by proxy, to maintain?

For my part, I am very free to say that the women, and children, and negroes who sided with the Republican party—and who did no voting at all—were, in every high sense of the words, consenting to, and represented in, the government, to a greater extent than that large body of Democratic voters to which I have alluded. Now, if taxation without representation be tyranny, what was the condition of these hundreds of thousands of men who were not only heavily taxed but subjected to a stringent conscription, and so uniformly outvoted in their different districts that the course of the government steadily misrepresented their warmest feelings and convictions?

Why do I bring forward these cases? To condemn the course of the government and of the Republican party? Not at all. But to show the danger of adopting those few general principles which are at present in every "radical's" mouth, as the basis of important political action, and as if they were the whole of the truth appertaining to the subject.

Times of great national excitement are also generally times of great fanaticism. Important truths, that have been overlooked or undervalued, being brought by earnest minds into just prominence, work out great changes in states and kingdoms. But it is seldom that the devotees of any such long-neglected truth, either in politics or religion, will pause in their advocacy of its claims at the proper period. They do not perceive that their special truth is not all the truth—that their cherished principle, for which they have done and suffered so much, is merely one flashing side as it were of a great and many-sided crystal. And, not perceiving this, they rush into fanaticism, which is simply the attempt to live by one true principle or aspect of truth, in utter disregard of the claims of other great principles which are equally true. Examine carefully, and you will find that the exclusive devotion to some one principle, which is true in itself, in its proper and harmonious degree, is the very essence of nearly all political and religious fanaticism.

And it is curious how, in this "carrying out," as it is termed, of individual principles, to the neglect of

all others, you are very apt to end at the very opposite point to that from which you started. The revolutionists of France began with demanding justice and liberty; they ended in the bloodiest injustice and tyranny. Robespierre personified the revolution when, beginning with such ultra peace notions that he opposed the punishment of death for murder, he ended by inaugurating in France the Reign of Terror. And thus in England, the Puritans, beginning by asserting for themselves the right to worship according to their consciences, ended by proscribing in religion all forms of worship but their own, and establishing in politics the dictatorship of Cromwell, in utter defiance of the will of the great majority of the nation.

Let us not imitate these errors of the past. Let the sober and conservative portion of this people array themselves like a barrier of iron against the wild and visionary fanaticism of the hour. Let us say to these well-meaning but insane dreamers, men and women: yes, ladies and gentlemen, what you say is true; but it is not the whole truth. "There are more things in heaven and earth than are dreamt of in *your* philosophy."

The Natural Right to Vote.

Let us consider this alleged natural right to vote from another point of view. What is voting? We have a common phrase in this country,—"the majority should *rule*." Yes, the voting of the majority

is ruling, governing. Those voters who make up the constitutional majority, are the true rulers of the country. Legislators, presidents, judges, are but their representatives, their hands. To vote, therefore, so far as the majority of voters are concerned, is to rule, to govern.

But to govern whom? *Themselves?* The phrase is current, that "every people have a right to govern *themselves*." But what is the fact, the truth? The constitutional majority of voters in this country—not always the absolute majority—have the right given them not only to govern themselves, but to govern the minority also. That minority may thus be governed in the very way they do not wish to be governed, made to do the very things they especially dislike doing. Made to contribute of their money and lives to steal foreign territory, or wage wars the most unjust and unholy.

Now I maintain that if there be any natural right to govern, it can be founded upon nothing else than the natural ability to govern wisely and well.

If the only governing that the majority of the voting class could possibly be called upon to do, was the governing of themselves, men might argue with more force that voting was a natural right, based upon the mere fact, I will not say of manhood, but of being created in the form of man. But all parts of society are so bound together that to vote may not only be to govern yourself, but me. Now to claim the right to do this you must manifest some capacity to do it. "The tools to the hands that can

use them," has been called a great Democratic doctrine. Be it Democratic or not, it is common reason and common sense.

To you who claim to have a natural right to govern, I oppose my natural right to be well governed. If you cannot govern the country well and wisely, you have no natural right to govern it, but only a constitutional one. For this is a case in which it is impossible that all parties should exercise their right of free agency, their natural individual liberty. The minority would never have any right of resistance and revolution, were it not that it is always implied that the ruling majority shall rule them fairly, and wisely, and well. If they do otherwise to an unbearable extent, the minority may rebel rightfully against a majority, however large, if they have reasonable hopes of success—and an impartial world, standing around as witnesses, and more, impartial history, will justify them, whether they succeed, or whether they utterly fail.

Yes, men may have a natural right as men, without regard to the measure of their ability, to be well and fairly governed—a natural right to life and liberty, and to pursue their own happiness, meddling not with other people's, in what wise or foolish paths they please—but a natural right, based upon a mere imperfectly developed manhood, to govern, that seems to me an absurdity which only needs to be fairly stated to be overthrown.

Let us look at this claim of a natural right to vote and to govern in a wider illustration. Of course, if

it be a natural right, it appertains to all men—to Chinese and Hindoos, and other Asiatics, as well as to negroes; to Heathen and Mohammedans as well as to Christians. Now, if the majority have the natural right to govern, it involves the corresponding duty of the minority to obey. And this is not only just as true, but even truer on a large scale than on a small. In the view of philosophic "Radicals," the claims of man as man, vastly transcend his claims as a White man, an American, a Protestant, or a Christian. State lines, and national and mental and religious differences, are as nothing compared with the paramount claim of man as man.

Who then have the natural right to rule this globe, and who owe to them the natural duty of obedience? The population of the world may be estimated somewhat as follows:

Pagans	780,000,000
Mohammedans	120,000,000
Greek and Roman Catholics	230,000,000
Protestants	80,000,000
Nothingarians	10,000,000
Total	1,220,000,000

Now have 780,000,000 of Pagans the natural right to govern this world? Would it be the natural duty of the comparatively small minority of Protestants to submit to such government? Would resistance on their part be treason to humanity, and an act of the greatest insolence and folly in presuming

to set up their judgment in opposition to that of the great mass of mankind?

You may say that the principle does not apply to the world at large, but only to the separate nations. But if you base the right of a majority to rule—not on a mere conventional agreement, subject to what modifications may be found to be necessary—but on the broad basis of natural right, it evidently does apply to all men on the face of the earth. Not only this, but a majority of the whole race evidently is the highest earthly authority in the world. And it is a fair argument, and not sophistry, as some will probably contend, to show the absurdity of this idea of natural right by extending it to the vast hordes of ignorant negroes and Asiatics beyond, as well as to those within our gates. We are not bound, if we see fit to allow negroes, Chinese, and ignorant Europeans to flock to this country by millions, to give them the power to rule us after they get here, any more than we are bound to obey their edicts for the government of this world, because they happen to outnumber us on the globe.

Republics have their demagogues, as absolute monarchies have their courtiers. The latter contend that their sovereign reigns by Divine Right; the former declare that their sovereign, the majority of the people, reigns by a Divine Natural Right also. However incapable or inefficient the king may be, the courtier declares "he can do no wrong," and should be implicitly obeyed—and the demagogue makes the

same claim for the majority of the people. One is just as honest and sensible as the other.

The Protection of Individual and Class Interests.

Having thus disposed, as I think, of the argument of natural right, let us consider various other arguments which have been brought forward in support of universal suffrage.

It is argued that every man should have the right to vote in order to protect his own interests. But I hope you have already seen that there is something deeper in the question than this. The protection of one, as he considers it, may involve the destruction of another—may really involve his own destruction also. An ignorant man, inflated by praise and self-complacency, may think he can steer your ship as well as the old helmsman. If he cannot, not only he may be the victim, but you also. If you give the elective franchise to large classes of ignorant men, it may often result, not in their *sharing* with you the management of affairs, but in their taking the management into their own hands altogether. The practical question therefore often becomes, which of the two classes can be most safely trusted with the general protection—the intelligent, or the ignorant?

For the last fifty years we have been trying the experiment of extending the suffrage in this country; and during all that time, the character of our public men has been steadily deteriorating, and the corrup-

tion steadily increasing in our legislative halls. Is there no connection between these facts?

You have some pure water in a pitcher. You pour out a glassful, and say that is good water. You throw in a spoonful of dirt, stir it up briskly, and pour out a second tumbler. Wonderful, is it not? this second tumbler is not quite so clear and pure as the first. You go on putting in the dirt—the most of it perhaps imported expressly from foreign countries, and every glass you pour out comes more and more turbid. What can have produced the change, wise editors ask. It is something miraculous, doubtless.

The fact is often worse than the illustration. The tumbler of water, poured from the top, will represent something better than the correct average of the water in the pitcher—but in your constituencies, remember, it is not the average of the whole, but only that of the majority which is represented—and that majority is often composed of all the meaner and more ignorant elements in the district.

Ignorance, even honest ignorance is, in the practical workings of politics, but little if any better than dishonesty and vice. The ignorant man, in nine cases out of ten, becomes the tool of some unprincipled demagogue. I am rather inclined to think that the knave is often the less dangerous man of the two,—for he will have at least sufficient sense to prevent him from plunging, and making you plunge with him, over some precipice, where nothing is to be gained, and everything endangered—a thing which your honest, well-meaning fool, with some

fanatical political or religious idea buzzing in his head, is as apt to do as not.

Of one thing I think we may all by this time be reasonably certain, that the representatives of the people will, as a general thing, represent the general average of the intelligence and virtue of those who vote for and elect them. I suppose that Fernando Wood and John Morrissey do fairly and correctly represent the moral and intellectual status of those who voted for them. And I infer from this that the only effectual way to improve the standard of our representatives, is to improve the standard of constituencies. How to do this is a difficult question; but it may be a question on which the long continuance of our republican institutions depends. One thing, however, is certain—it is not to be done by putting additional spoonfuls, and even black shovelfuls, of ignorant dirt into the electoral pitcher. We have got already just about as much of that as we can manage, and the question should be how to purify, not how further to pollute.

The Suffrage as an Educator.

But it is said that our system of common schools will finally bring all things right, and that the practice of voting is itself an educator. I hope and trust the common schools will do much—though New York City is a pretty good proof that you may have both excellent common schools and the practice of voting in full blast for years, without producing any percep-

tible effect for the better. If New York City is governed any better than it was twenty years ago, its more intelligent citizens generally are entirely unaware of the fact.

And this case of New York City shows clearly how, in running the suffrage idea "into the ground," you overthrow the very principle of self-government itself. For the majority of voters in that city being too ignorant or vicious to govern it wisely, the power is being gradually taken out of their hands. The police department is already in the charge of commissioners appointed by the Governor, and the State Legislature is now considering the policy of establishing commissions to build the markets, to manage the schools, and even to open the streets and to take charge of their piers and wharves for them. And thus the right of local self-government, through an unwise extension of the franchise, is passing out of the hands of the people of that great city,—the property holders preferring the lesser of two evils. Thus, in pushing the idea of liberty to a foolish extreme, you lose the amount of liberty which is possible. You grasp at a mere empty shadow, and lose the substance. You make men your rulers who have not the capacity to rule, and then gladly welcome any usurper who will thrust aside Councilman Log and Alderman Stork, and manage matters with at least a decent approach to honesty and common sense.*

I do not deny that voting may sometimes act of

* See "New York City," in Appendix.

itself as an educator in a certain degree. It may improve some men, I grant; but it may corrupt others. In certain districts of England, for instance, it is the custom of a large proportion of the voters to vote for the candidate who will pay the highest. Thus in the borough of Lancaster, which includes a country district, it has been ascertained by a Parliamentary commission, that out of a total number of 1419 voters, 717, or rather more than a majority, received bribes at a recent election. A correspondent of the *New York Tribune*, not long since, wrote as follows of the negroes of Jamaica:

"The elective franchise represents to the ignorant blacks two shillings and as much rum as they choose to drink on election day, at the expense of the candidates. The most worthy and intelligent blacks I have met seldom or never use their right to vote, not thinking it worth the cost of the register tax. *If a candidate has so much need of their votes as to pay the expense of bringing them to the polls, the longest purse would be sure of a majority.*"*

I do not doubt that bribes of various kinds, from glasses of bad liquor to money and small political appointments and other advantages, are made to influence large numbers of voters in the United

* It is very noticeable that the whites of Jamaica have recently procured the abolition of the principle of self-government in that island; preferring to be governed by a Council appointed by the Crown, rather than by the representatives of a horde of ignorant negroes. Thus the extension of the suffrage to the negroes of Jamaica has naturally led to the abolition of popular government in that island.

States. Now, in all such cases, the possession of the vote tends to the corruption and debasement of the man. He becomes less fit to be a voter, more fit to be the mere tool of unscrupulous demagogues from year to year. His vote not only curses the country and his fellow-citizens, but aids in demoralizing himself.

But, granting that the possession of the vote may sometimes work the other way, and aid in the intellectual improvement of a very ignorant man, this is not conclusive of the question even in his case. If you give your gold watch to a person who knows nothing about watches, to mend, he cannot even try to do it without learning something. The veriest barbarian, who has never seen a watch before in his life, would at least find out there was not a little insect inside which did the ticking. But would it not be rather a costly mode of educating an ignorant man to let him run the risk of spoiling your gold watch for you? And what is the value of a gold watch to that of this great American Republic? We, who will not allow a man who knows nothing about watches to tamper with our silver and gold time-keepers, although he may educate himself a little in so doing, shall we intrust to the management of a horde of ignorant foreigners or negroes this glorious frame and model of constitutional freedom, this great Republican time-keeper of the world?

Should the work of government, with its infinite and complicated interests, its constant danger of doing too much, its often danger of doing too little—

a work demanding the wisest heads, the most evenly balanced judgments, the lessons of the past, the best culture of the present, be thrown open to the apprentice hands of uneducated foreigners, and the utterly unskilled hands of ignorant negroes, just released from centuries of bondage? And is it hoped that Providence will take care of us and ward off the natural consequences of our folly, because we have done it all out of philanthropy and unselfishness, and with the best intentions? These are the kind of good intentions that the hell of nations is paved with. The stern fates that rule in this world never pardon folly because it is unselfish. You who have the helm in your hands, and know you have the ability to sail the ship, owe it to your country, and your God, and the interests of the great cause of republican freedom, not to intrust to presumptuous ignorance a task that it has not the capacity to perform. Too far already have you walked on that road which leads to legislative imbecility and corruption first, and thence to despotism. Be warned in time, and go no further.

I have spoken of the demoralizing influence which the possession of the vote may exert upon ignorant, and not very scrupulous, men. There is another view even more important. You have an ignorant constituency in the first place, and, as an inevitable result in the long run, a corrupt set of legislators. What, now, is the next result? Continual examples of corruption in high places, and a low standard of political honesty. Now, this legislative example

continually reacts upon the whole community, educating society downward into baser and baser habits of thought and modes of action.*

If the most necessary measures of a private character, or of a mixed private and public character, cannot be passed through the legislature except by the giving of bribes, men are at last induced to give bribes who at first scorned the doing of such things. And the better portion of the legislature learn gradually to be less scrupulous as they see how their baser brethren are prospering in their ill-gotten gains, and apparently losing nothing in the estimation of the community. Until finally the practice of taking bribes comes to be justified and defended in common conversation, as I have heard it defended, by men who should know better.

Now this effect does not stop here. You cannot produce a lower state of political integrity, without affecting business integrity also. And the demoralizing effect upon a nation of having corrupt rulers, will necessarily permeate all the relations of life.†

* "The Rev. Henry Ward Beecher recently said, in the pulpit that perhaps the government of the City of New York did more moral harm to the people of New York than all the churches together did good."—*Parton.*

† Mr. Parton, in his caustic pamphlet, "How New York City is Governed," speaks as follows of the Legislature of New York, which is probably not much more corrupt than the average of our legislative bodies:

"The same seven men who control the politics of the city nominate the city members of the Legislature; and these, reinforced by corrupt men from other cities, control one branch of the Legislature and are powerful in the other. Sometimes the city leaders cause themselves to be elected to the Legislature; but usually they select, from the clerks in the public offices, their own creatures,—mindless, dependent men, whose only virtue is a cur-like fidelity to their masters. No language can overstate the hopeless incapacity of these men for the business of legislation. They can only vote as they are ordered; and if you wish to buy their votes, you must arrange the price, not with them, but their owners in New York. To elect such men to the Legislature, is only to transfer power from the Legislature to the lobby. There at Albany we see, within the rails of the Assembly, a crowd of poor, ignorant, irresponsible clerks; and in the lobby we find men representing Cornelius Vanderbilt, the Central Railroad, the Erie Railroad, the Astor estate, and many other men and companies, controlling vast resources and carrying great prestige. Moreover, these agents are persons of skill and audacity. When such a reversal of the natural order of things exists, and when the members of the Legislature are paid by the State a less sum per day than their board costs, what must be the result?"

The veteran New York politician, Thurlow Weed, also recently gave in his evidence in the *Daily Times* as follows:

"Formerly the *suspicion* of corruption in a member would have put him 'into Coventry,' while *knowledge* of such an offense would have insured the expulsion of the offender. Now 'bribery and corruption' prevail to an extent greater than existed in the worst days of the Parliament of England, where, happily for England, the practice has been reformed, as it must be here, or corruption will undermine the government. No measure, however meritorious, escapes the attention of 'strikers.' Venal members openly solicit appointment on paying committees. In the better days of legislation, when no unlawful motive existed, it was considered *indelicate* in a member to indicate to the Speaker any preference about committees. The evil has been growing, each year being worse than the preceding, until re-

The Scripture says: "He that ruleth over men should be just; ruling in the fear of God." Good

sense says: Choose the ablest, wisest, and best men among you to be your legislators, your executive officers, your judges. Ignorance, and folly, and political fanaticism come along and say: "A man is a man," "one man is as good and wise as another," "it requires very little wisdom to govern a nation," —and the result is that the nation is governed as you may suppose, things going from bad to worse, until the Almighty mercifully sends along some thunder-storm of war to purify the elements, and give this American people one chance more to prove that they know how, as they phrase it, to "govern themselves."

But some will say, that unless all classes are allowed to vote, the omitted classes will have no protection, and will be oppressed. I answer that, at the worst, it is better that some should be oppressed than that the whole Republic, with its precious freight, should go to the bottom. Perfection in government

form is sternly demanded. *Could the secret history of the present Legislature be exposed to the public gaze, popular indignation would be awakened to a degree heretofore unknown. In the Assembly everything was struck at. Not even a religious charity found exemption.* That there were honest and honorable members in both houses, by whose integrity and firmness much bad legislation was arrested, is true. The Senate, fortunately, presents an inflexible majority of upright members; while in the House, the Ring was formidable enough to put through whatever paid or promised to pay liberally, in defiance and derision of the efforts of an honest minority."

See also the late revelations as to the legislature of Pennsylvania—how bills are passed by the hundred *without* even being read!

is not possible, more than in anything else. Arrange things as you will, you cannot avoid the danger of certain classes being oppressed. If your suffrage is entirely unrestricted, that class which happens to be the most numerous will be apt to take care of itself, whether in so doing it injures others or not. You may give the mouse by law the same right to tread on the elephant as the elephant has to tread upon him, but practically the mouse will be always in danger. But if there be any virtue in intelligence and culture, there is less danger to be apprehended from the rule of the intelligent than the rule of the ignorant. The strongest protests in this country against the slavery of the negroes, for instance, the most powerful efforts for their liberation, always have come from the intelligence and not from the ignorance of the country—and even more from the white abolitionists than from the negroes, bond or free, themselves. If this were not so, it would be an argument against education and culture. Why take any trouble to educate men, if the ignorant are as wise and magnanimous and just?

It is contended that the ruling classes are so selfish as to be unable to give reasonable protection to the negroes; and yet they are asked in the same breath to give all of them—without regard to their qualifications—the right to vote. They cannot be trusted to give the negroes what they are fairly entitled to; and yet are supposed to be so foolishly generous as to give them a position which they are

not entitled to. But if we white men are so liberal that it does not seem absurd to ask us to give the negroes a franchise to which as a whole they have no reasonable claim, we cannot also be so selfish and mean as to deny them that justice and protection which are their due. We have abolished slavery in the whole country, North and South, although the negroes had no votes—and this was a much more difficult work than it will be to see that they have justice and fair play as freedmen.

Universal Negro Suffrage.

If the views which I have advanced be founded in a fair degree upon sound reason, the question of admitting at once to the right of suffrage probably 800,000 ignorant negroes, a very small proportion of whom can even read and write, becomes one of the most momentous importance. In a question of so vast a character, considerations of mere temporary expediency, of mere party advantage, fall paralyzed to the ground. It is not a question that affects the Southern states alone—though of course it is to them of the most vital importance—but its decision likewise will affect for good or evil every portion of the Union.

John Stuart Mill is perhaps the ablest champion of the doctrine of Universal Suffrage—although even he would not grant every man a vote unless the more intelligent classes could have *more than one vote* apiece—but he adds that no one but those in whom

theory has silenced common sense, would maintain that power over others, over the whole community, should be given to persons who cannot read and write, and perform the simpler problems of arithmetic. But here we have a proposition to give the suffrage to 800,000 men, a very small proportion of whom would be eligible under even Mr. Mill's rule.

And we, the citizens of states which, having comparatively a very few colored people in their midst, will not, as a general thing, allow those few to vote, are considering whether we shall take advantage of our having the power, to force on others by the bushel, what we are scarcely willing ourselves to accept by the single grain.

But some will say, what matters it how we treat rebels? Rebels have no rights that any Union man is bound to respect. But they no longer occupy the position of rebels. I grant that they are not in a very good humor; but, curious as it may seem, a tremendous thrashing seldom has the effect of making men feel particularly happy and amiable. The French, after Waterloo, were continually picking quarrels with the English officers in Paris. Certainly, if defeated men have not a natural right to grumble and feel perverse, they always act as if these were among their natural rights.

And yet, after all, they are our own flesh and blood. Men who have made one of the most splendid fights of which history bears record. True chips, cut a little crooked, of the grand old Caucasian block. Men whom it is an honor to have conquered.

We fought them because we thought it was better for all of us that we should continue to live under the same old roof, beneath the same old stars; and still as brethren. But if we continue to feel toward them as toward enemies, how shall the old family concord and harmony ever be restored? We have duties toward the Southern whites as well as toward the blacks—toward these men who are, in a different sense from what the negroes are, *our own flesh and blood.*

How were these men led into rebellion? It is a short story. From the very first there have been two parties in this Union—those who held it was a union of the people, and for all time; and those who held it was a union of States, and dissolvable, like any other partnership, at the pleasure of its individual members. Of the leading men of the Southern States, a large proportion have always held that, while they owed a *qualified* allegiance to the United States, they owed their main and paramount allegiance to the particular State of which they were citizens. While Northerners, in foreign countries, always spoke of themselves as *Americans*, these Southerners would say they were *Virginians*, *South Carolinians*, *Kentuckians*, and so on. The poet Whittier, in his splendid poem on Randolph of Roanoke, typified the whole class when he said:

"Too honest or too proud to feign
A love he never cherished,
Beyond Virginia's border-line
His patriotism perished.

While others hailed in distant skies
Our eagle's dusky pinion,
He only saw the mountain bird
Stoop o'er his old Dominion."

Now you will understand how men, brought up in this faith, like General Lee and others, when they had to choose between their allegiance to their native States and to the Union, obeyed what they falsely conceived to be the call of duty. They held that their oath to support the Constitution of the United States was simply a qualified oath, binding them no longer than their State remained in the common partnership, to which State alone they owed paramount allegiance. It is necessary that these things should be remembered, in order that you should judge wisely and mercifully, and as you one day hope to be judged by the Great Judge of all.

Now note one curious fact. We have had disunionists here at the North—men who proclaimed constantly that the Union was "a covenant with death and an agreement with hell"—men who would, if they could, have carried the New England States out of the Union at any moment. Men whose ultra and foolish notions I, as an avowed but moderate abolitionist, always earnestly opposed. And yet these would-have-been disunionists of the North are the most uncharitable people we have now toward their fellow-sinners of the South. I confess it both amuses and saddens me to hear an old-school, Garrison, Wendell-Phillips abolititionist talk about rebels having no rights which loyal men are bound

to respect,—I all the time knowing what a rebel he used to be at heart himself, and how he will be again if everything is not done just in accordance with his peculiar views of what is best for the country.*

* For example, read the following editorial paragraphs from the *Anti-Slavery Standard*, the official organ of the American Anti-Slavery Society, of Feb. 23d last:

"*The most the principals and active supporters of the rebellion could reasonably ask for was, that their necks be saved from the halter.* Property they should be made to contribute, for their own good as for the general welfare of the nation, to repair as far as possible the injury occasioned by *their murderous treason.* The hundreds of thousands of precious lives destroyed, it is, of course, beyond their power to restore. But to *confiscation*, and to subordination in the political councils of the future, the nation may and should demand their unqualified assent. To assist in again clothing them with power and the opportunity for mischief, without ample repentance and reformation, is to trifle with the negro and the loyal whites, is cruelty and not kindness to the rebels themselves, and gratuitously to discourage national growth and prosperity.

"The old Union we do not want restored. It was an infamous bargain between aristocracy and a pretended democracy, *for the destruction of which we are profoundly grateful.* We do not want, and *do not mean to accept*, any reconstruction which does not secure political equality for all loyal people, with ample guarantees, and due subordination of pro-slavery traitors. We admonish the XLth Congress, as we did its predecessor, that its very first business in order should be the impeachment and deposition of Andrew Johnson. It should not stultify itself by consenting to receive a message from him."

Here is bitter denunciation of other men's disloyalty, mixed up with the vaunting avowal of the writer's own disloyalty in times past, and with a threat of future disloyalty in case reconstruction is not managed according to his peculiar ideas of what is just and proper. This gentleman evidently holds that nobody has a right to rebel except the "saints," and that he is one of the "saints."

I am not in favor of giving up any of the fair fruits of the war We fought the war, in the first place, for the Constitution and the Union. We have gained them, if we are wise enough not to abuse our power and create a despotism. We fought it in the second place, incidentally, for the abolition of slavery. We have gained it. Slavery is abolished. It is right, in the third place, that the Union debt should be paid, and that the rebel debt should not be paid, and this also should be in the Constitution. I also think it only fair and just that the rebel leaders should retire from active political life, and not be exposed again to the corruptions of Washington City. It is a slight penalty to pay for such a tremendous mistake. Let them retire gracefully, and allow a new South to come upon the stage.

But it is urged that universal suffrage has become a necessity, in order to build up a loyal party in the Southern States. But will you really gain anything by utterly disgusting the greater portion of the white population of the South by such shameful injustice, even if you succeed in obtaining a large negro vote? The loyal party I wish to build up in the South I wish composed of the intelligence of the South, and of the energetic white population. Of course, this will be the work of time; the passions and prejudices of men who are worthy of the name are not to be changed in the twinkling of an eye, by their defeat on the battle-field. But by being fair and just toward them, and invoking the aid of time, and of the new issues which time will bring, the pas-

sions of the past will gradually die out, and a genuine and substantial love for the Union take their place.

For my own part, I do not believe that whatever Congress may in its folly enact, it will be possible really to give the exercise of the suffrage, as a general and established thing, to the negroes, *in opposition to the will of the great majority of the Southern white people.* Of course, if the people of the North had the matter so much at heart that they would be willing to raise large armies, so that detachments might be stationed in every Southern district, I think the thing might work, so long as the armies were kept there. But, judging by myself, and comparing the limited extent of my prejudice against the colored race with that of the generality of the Northern people, I do not believe that the people of the North will allow large armies to be raised for any such unfair and oppressive purpose.

I know that, in the Congressional election of last autumn, it was declared again and again and continually in my own district by the Republican speakers, that the Constitutional Amendment was the point at issue, and by that amendment the question of negro suffrage was to be left to every State to determine for itself. And I am just as certain as I ever was of anything not proved to be a fact, that if the Republican party had not taken this ground in the Middle and Western States, but had committed itself to the radical plan of forcing universal negro suffrage upon the South, the result of

the election would have by no means been the overwhelming Republican victory that it was.

You have given the negroes their freedom. I say *given* it to them. Seldom, in the history of the world, have four millions of people obtained their liberty from a grievous bondage with so little effort of their own, so little risk, so little sacrifice, so little expenditure of bravery and of blood.

We have given them their liberty, and they now hold their liberty because we will it so. Should we take away our hand, the whole fabric of slavery could be restored, if the Southern whites so willed, without probably the loss of one hundred lives.

There is a great deal of folly talked in relation to the help afforded us by the negroes during the war. That they did help us is true—why should they not? it was in a large degree their own cause. That many of the race did all that men could be expected to do, I will not deny. And they have already been more than paid for it. But what did the great masses of the four millions of slaves do? When nearly all of the able-bodied whites of the South were on their frontier, did the behavior of the negroes necessitate the least crippling of the rebel strength? The old men, and the boys, and the women of the South kept that immense body of slaves perfectly quiet. Not a telegraph wire was cut—not a railroad track broken—not a depot of arms and army provisions fired—through the whole course of the war. I say not one, for I do not remember to have heard of any. If there were a few

cases in the interior, in which the noble and daring example of Robert Smalls in Charleston harbor was imitated, they were so few as not to lessen the force of this statement.

Certainly the greater portion of this four millions of slaves, of whom it is proposed to give some 800,000 the right to vote, have no *claim* upon us. But if they had, we have settled that, and tenfold more than all their race has done, by giving them their freedom.

As to the blacks who were enlisted in the Southern (rebel) States, a large number of them were enlisted as you would enlist the services of a horse or of a mule. Colonel (afterward General) William Birney went, for instance, into Maryland, and took them right out of their masters' hands, with very little asking either of themselves or their masters. A United States officer would see a stout-looking negro in one of the rebellious States. "Do you not want to enlist?" would say the officer. "Oh, no, massa, I don't want to fight on either side!" "Pshaw! I know better than that—come along with me." The negro, always accustomed to obeying a white man, and especially a military officer, would not think of disobeying, and he would be marched off and sworn into the service, even while protesting all the time, as much as he dared, that he did not wish to be a soldier.

It is not pleasant to have to state these facts. I never would add needlessly to the prejudice with which any unpopular race is regarded. But the

frequent overstatements of certain radical gentlemen, force these truths from me. My own opinion of the courage and manliness of the negroes of the South was not raised by the war. I had thought that they would give their masters threefold, yes tenfold the trouble they did. I did not think they would indulge in useless and indiscriminate massacre. But I did think, *and abolitionists generally thought*, that they would refuse to work, that they would demand their freedom, would run off in large numbers, would cut telegraph wires, would destroy railroad tracks, and prove generally so intractable as seriously to impair the military strength that the South could bring against us. But, on the contrary, they were docile almost beyond all precedent in the history of the world. With the exception of their not being fighters, the South realized almost as much advantage from them as if they had been devoted to the rebel cause. The Southern whites, it was proved, knew them better than we did. And if the right of suffrage were given to them to-morrow, I for one should not be at all surprised to see the great majority of them voting the ticket of their old masters.*

We have attained our object—we have given the negroes their freedom. In their present condition of ignorance, and in the present state of public sentiment, it is as far as we can safely go. In removing

* This essay was written before the passage of the Reconstruction Bill.

slavery, we have removed what the abolitionists always told us was the great bar to their intellectual, moral, and social advancement. There is no law now against their education, their saving of their earnings; no law allowing the parting of man from wife, of mother from child. They have the same rights to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness which we have—as many rights as a large proportion of the white men in the world enjoy. If there is to be any trial of universal negro suffrage, let it be in these Northern States, where the negroes are fewer in number, better educated, and more intelligent than in the South; and let the States which are most in favor of it try it first. If it works well on trial, it can easily be extended, for it is much easier to grant the suffrage than to take it away.*

* Even Gen. Butler, always a man of extremes, and "radical" as he is *at present*, and an object of constant admiration to Mr. Wendell Phillips and his disciples, said in his Impeachment speech at New York, according to the report in the *Tribune:* "Now that organized resistance to the laws has ceased in that territory which the sword, and the sword alone, has conquered—how shall the people thereof, with safety to themselves and to the whole country, be brought to enjoy the blessings of free institutions insuring equality of right and justice to all? That problem so vast, so momentous, so vital, can only be solved by the wisdom of experience learning from the events of the past. Political expedients adjusting balances of power; conventions framing constitutions of government; presidents inventing policies of reconstruction; Congress passing acts of admission or rejection of reorganized or disorganized States, cannot compass it; each and all, all the devices of Statecraft will fail as they always, under like conditions, have failed. Even the new boon, universal freedom, has not and will not accomplish it. *Universal, impartial suffrage allied to universal ignorance, will only add to the danger; giving to the masses the club of Hercules to be wielded with the strength of the blind Samson, after he has been a slave grinding in the prison-house of the Philistines.*"

If a different course be pursued, one need not be a prophet to foresee that the consequences will probably be disastrous to the colored people themselves. The prejudice against them still lies deep in the national heart. Treat it, so far as it is a mere baseless prejudice, as the wise physician does a deep-seated disease. That prejudice is not entirely a wicked and unholy one. The prejudice, if it is fairly called such, that a superior race feels against mingling with an inferior one is, if not carried beyond its proper limits, wholesome, and natural, and right. It is often a just and reasonable prejudice against ignorance and filthiness, which leave their mark and their smell clinging to a barbarous people for centuries.

As the negro race becomes educated and refined, it will gradually conquer this prejudice, because it will deprive it of all reasonableness. But quacks, in politics as in medicine, never are willing to leave anything to the slow but sure operations of nature and time. They have some one grand cure-all, and that cures everything, and at once.

Qualifications for the Suffrage.

If you ask me whether I think the mere fact of a man's being more or less black a good reason why he

should not be allowed to vote, I answer that of course I do not. In legislating in theory, I should never make a distinction of privileges, based upon the mere color of a man's skin. Neither should I go off into enthusiastic raptures because I heard that a black man had been elected to fill some office, simply because he was black. But abstract theory, when it comes to be put into practice, must take a practical shape, according to the varying circumstances.

I, for one, would not oppose the extension of the New York law, by which any negro who owns unincumbered taxable property to the amount of $250 is allowed to vote, to every Northern State, although I should prefer to have that coupled with certain intellectual qualifications, designed more effectually to separate the negro wheat from the negro chaff.

The mere reading and writing test I think entirely inadequate. Of course no person should be allowed to vote who could not read and write, and cipher so far as the rule of three; but some of us have boys of seven years of age who can do that much, and yet whom we do not consider quite suitable persons to be gifted with the franchise. Proof of having passed through a three or five years' course of education in our common or private schools, would be a much more sensible test of a man's possessing sufficient intelligence to become one of the ruling majority of the land.

The property qualification, so popular with our ancestors, is so unpopular now that probably it will be objected to even in the case of negro suffrage.

And yet that property qualification was founded upon a political principle, the truth of which is strenuously insisted upon by even the wildest "radicals." That principle is that taxation and representation should go together. Believing in this principle, our fathers held that to give large numbers of men who pay no taxes, or mere nominal taxes, the vote, is, in its practical workings, to take away the representation from those who really pay the great bulk of the taxes, and thus give one man the right to vote away another man's money. That this is a correct view, the City of New York at the present time fully illustrates. One set of men pay the taxes into the city treasury, and another larger number elect the representatives who vote them away. Now, this is practically taxation without representation; and, to avoid it, our fathers instituted a property qualification.

They also looked at the matter in another light. They considered the virtues which the accumulation of a small property demands—industry, frugality, temperance; no mean virtues these. And the man, having acquired the property, feels himself doubly a man, and identified with all the best interests of society, and with the prosperity and preservation of the state, in a manner he never was before. No corrupt spending of money by his representatives now, for he feels it in the increased taxes on that little house or homestead. No agrarian nonsense now! what! idlers and spendthrifts lay their hands upon his property, the fruit of years of toil and saving! No foolish wars to burn down other men's property,

and consume his own by taxation also! He has become part and parcel of the state and of the world; his vote will be the result of careful thought, and of the very best wisdom that the Creator has bestowed upon him.

So at least our ancestors reasoned, and, as I think, with much force. I apprehend that at the present time there are no classes of men who vote more uniformly against extravagant and corrupt outlays of the public money, and who are more careful, sincere, and honest in their votes, than that class which, beginning life as poor men, almost without a dollar, have managed through industry, sobriety, and economy to acquire a small property.

There is another class of our population, that of educated or skilled workmen—including skilled mechanics, the higher operatives in manufacturing establishments, and clerks and book-keepers—of whose capacity as voters I think very highly. A considerable proportion of the very few who in this country give any study to the philosophy of politics and government, belong, I am inclined to believe from certain facts in my experience, to these classes. One reason probably of this is, that the pursuit of wealth does not engross them so much as it does certain other classes, who have greater advantages in the respect of money getting. What some of our merchants, for instance, know about politics, must come to them, one would think, as a direct gift from heaven, for certainly they do not often read more than the shortest abstracts they can find, either of

political speeches, or of state papers; while as to reading any book upon political subjects, they would as soon think of reading a volume of sermons.

The mere fact of a man's being a skilled workman, of itself implies the possession of a considerable degree of intelligence—while in working at his business, he learns certain great truths of moderation, caution, and the wise adaptation of means to ends, which, unless he be naturally wasteful or intemperate, generally make him a safe and judicious voter.

It does not by any means follow, that because the possession of a small amount of property is indicative of the possession of certain very important virtues, a man's virtue and intelligence are to be gauged by the extent of his possessions. Great wealth is often, on the contrary, the mere sign of a grasping and mean and exacting nature. And a man given over to the mere pursuit of money—who forgets politics, literature, science, human sympathy, almost everything, in the fierce desire to heap up more and more of filthy lucre, and become a millionaire, always reminds me of the words of the Saviour, that "it is easier for a camel to pass through the eye of a needle, than for a rich man to enter the kingdom of heaven." Certainly such an one would not desire to enter the kingdom of heaven, unless there was some good bargain to be obtained there, or his money could be invested at two per cent. a month interest. And as to voting, were it not for the heavy taxes such men pay, and that their influ-

ence is also generally exerted against extravagance, the country would not lose much by depriving them of the possibility of controlling its destiny.

Dr. Franklin's famous illustration of the absurdity of a property qualification, seems to me more witty than forcible. In a certain State having the small property qualification of $50, a poor man, owning nothing, cannot vote. He manages, however, to save enough by the next election to buy a donkey worth the requisite amount. Now, said the facetious doctor, which votes, the man, or the donkey?

It might fairly be answered, in the same vein, that perhaps it really matters very little which—the four-legged donkey, or the two-legged one. And further, that perhaps the four-legged donkey were really to be preferred as a voter—the chances being that he at least would half the time vote right; while the two-legged donkey, especially if there were any bad whiskey about, would be pretty certain all the time to vote wrong.

But, putting badinage aside, if the property qualification has induced the destitute voter of Dr. Franklin's story, to exercise the virtues of industry, sobriety, and economy to that extent, that he has been enabled to buy a donkey, and thus become a voter, has it not done a good service for the man? Having thus obtained the donkey, is he not probably better qualified to be a voter than he was before? And if you make the suffrage so cheap that every ignorant and worthless man can be a voter—instead of making it something of a prize to be valued—have you

not removed a strong incentive to improvement? Surely Dr. Franklin could not have thought that a man was fit to be intrusted with a share in determining the destinies of a great republic—to be, if in the majority, a ruler not only of himself but of other men—who had not the requisite sagacity, or industry, or sobriety to acquire the ownership of a common donkey?

But it may be said that every man in the community really does pay a considerable tax to the Federal government, inasmuch as the duties on imports ultimately are paid by the consumers of such imports. I admit that this is generally the case, so far as the tariff is merely one for revenue, and not for protection. When it is protective, as it is levied with the avowed object of preventing the price of labor in this country from being reduced by being brought into competition with the labor of foreigners, so far as it accomplishes this end, it must really be regarded on the whole as a bounty paid to the laboring classes, and not as a tax.

In the cases of state, county, and city taxes, which are direct in their character, it may also be urged that every man really pays a greater or less proportion of them, inasmuch as they increase the price of house rent and the general cost of living.

While I do not admit the universality and regularity of the practical working of the principle of distribution here contended for, I am quite willing to admit it as a general statement of the truth. And if I were a believer that the right of suffrage should

follow inevitably from the payment of taxes—that the payment of taxes was not merely one element of the question, but the main or only element—the inference would be very clear that not only all men (including those of foreign birth) who pay a direct or indirect tax, but all women, and even minors who maintain themselves, also, should be intrusted with the elective franchise.

But while I consider the payment of taxes a proper matter for consideration in determining who shall be vested with the suffrage, I hold that the question of capability far outweighs it. For, as I have previously instanced, it is not only the right to govern yourself which is in question, but the right to govern others. And, if a property qualification is adopted, it should be not only on the ground that taxation and representation properly go together, but mainly because it is a suitable test among others of the voter's ability to manage the property and other interests of the community.

If the question of government were entirely a question of property, then we might allow each man votes in proportion to the extent of his possessions, as we do in joint-stock companies. But while government has a great deal to do with property, it also has to deal largely with questions involving personal privileges and liberties. And this being the case, while we may fairly give just weight to property, we should not allow it unduly to preponderate.

Now, coming back to the point of indirect taxation, the payment of such taxes proves little as to the

amount of virtue which is in a man, compared to that which is proven by the acquisition of property. It manifests the possession of no great amount of virtue to spend fifty dollars every year for whiskey, even if thirty dollars of that amount be really the payment of a revenue tax. It is the saving of money, not the spending, which manifests self-control, temperance, and frugality.

Again, indirect taxation is very little felt. This is the reason that such taxes are levied. The man who really pays a hundred dollars a year in the shape of duties incorporated with the price of his clothing and groceries, cares very little about it, compared to what he would if a direct bill for only twenty dollars were presented against him by a tax collector. And therefore it is that the possession of property that can be directly taxed, is important as an element of moderation and economy in the voting classes.

In answer to those who are outraged at the idea that property should have any influence at all in a republican government, all I have to say is, that property *will* have its influence. If it cannot have it fairly, it will have it unfairly. It will either bribe the electors by the wholesale, as in England, or bribe the elected—as being the cheaper and wiser plan—as in the United States. And, in saying this, I am merely proclaiming a fact, not justifying it, nor wondering at it. I applaud a man for the exercise of Roman virtue; I honor him who will see the results of long years of economy and toil, those savings

which are his life and the life of his children, swept from him by incompetent or reckless legislation, rather than spend a dollar in any unworthy mode to prevent it; but, knowing what human nature is, I neither expect to see such heroic virtue generally practised, nor feel disposed to censure those who fall short of its requirements as if they were deserving of more blame than the average of mankind.

Therefore, partly as an acknowledgment that something is due to property in the organization of the government, and mainly because the acquisition of a reasonable amount of property is indicative of certain virtues, and its possession somewhat of a guard against recklessness in the public expenditures, I would allow no man to vote except he possessed a certain amount, subject to direct taxation.

As to what that amount should be, there is a great deal to be said, which it is useless to say now. My own views incline to fixing the amount at about the value of one year's labor of any unskilled workman—say, in the United States, at the average sum of $250.

This sum would not be so high but that any laboring man, possessing a reasonable amount of industry, sobriety, and intelligence, could acquire it by the time he was twenty-four, especially if he remained unmarried; and, according to physiologists, marriages before that age are not desirable.* I am

* According to the census tables, men generally do not marry before twenty-four years of age.

convinced that with the prize of the suffrage before them, thousands of laboring men would be just $250 richer at the age of twenty-four than they now are; and thus would have something to start their married life with, which they would feel the benefit of for many years, if not until the end of their days.

But the community, in my opinion, has a right to demand other proofs of the possession of a reasonable amount of ability, qualifying the voter to govern the state. With this view I would provide that, where common schools exist, the voter should have received the benefits of education for at least three years.

In applying these rules practically, I should not favor the depriving any man of the suffrage who has been heretofore allowed to exercise it. But they might be applied to all new cases, either of the native born or naturalized citizens.

There is scarcely an argument that is relied upon in favor of universal suffrage, so far as men are concerned, that will not apply equally well to a large proportion of minors. For instance, as to intelligence, there are hundreds of thousands of native white youths between the ages of twelve and twenty-one, who are more intelligent, and better instructed in all that relates to politics, than nine-tenths of the negroes and three-fourths of the foreign immigrants. Added to this, tens of thousands between the ages of fifteen and twenty-one have served their country in the field as soldiers, and signalized themselves as among the bravest of the brave. Thousands also

maintain themselves by their own labor, and other thousands not only do this, but aid in the support of their parents, brothers, and sisters, and thus indirectly pay taxes to the state.

Again; if an unrepresented class is, as the "radicals" contend, necessarily an oppressed class, why should not our children be represented? Are not their rights as precious as those of the negroes? Certainly they are very often unfairly treated by men and women, who presume upon their relationship or their age. Will children's rights ever be safe until the suffrage is conferred upon this very numerous and important class? As to not knowing enough to vote understandingly, even a very small child generally is quite able to perceive who is its friend. Give the children the right to vote then, in order that they may be properly protected from foolish or tyrannical parents, from cruel and despotic teachers, from rough and arrogant policemen, from unjust guardians and judges, from the unnumbered oppressions under which this large class suffers.*

* The Rev. Dr. Miller, in a recent address before the Young Men's Christian Association of Manchester, England, complained that the boys were getting too obstreperous and insubordinate—that "the standard of parental authority had been lowered." Upon which assertions the London *Spectator* comments as follows, showing that the *boys' rights'* movement has already begun:

"The main benefit, however, of the relaxation of household manners is, as we take it, the very effect of which Dr. Miller so feelingly complains. The young have been tempted by it to use their reason, instead of accepting things blindly. Finding that

Does not government exist by the consent of the governed? Have the children consented? and

they have to hold their own against argument as well as authority, they are compelled to think, and the lad who thinks upon any subject is certain, sooner or later, to use his power of thinking upon all. Of course they stagger or run, just as children do when they begin to walk; but surely the sort of rush with which a child of two years gets from point to point, head down, body swaying forward, and little feet pattering at speed, because a slower pace would involve a fall, is better, much better, than not walking at all. If boys and girls are really to be saved or damned according to their belief in the power of a priest to absolve, surely it is good they should reason on absolution, and should state their conclusions. How else are they to be corrected? 'Keep your whistles going, boy,' says the engine-driver in *Dombey and Son* to his boy, 'and let us know where you are.' And wise fathers will always want to know, above all things, whither their sons' minds tend. To compel them to silence, as Dr. Miller would apparently advise, is simply to compel them to go wrong. It is impossible, in the present age, to prevent their thinking, impossible to keep newspapers out of their hands, impossible to prevent discussion among themselves, and the only corrective on all these things is discussion with their elders, to which Dr. Miller is opposed. So are the Jesuit fathers, and the result on the seminarists of their training—which is merely the old household discipline carried to perfection—is its sufficient condemnation. Their boys grow up gentlemanly, quiet, unobtrusive young hypocrites, beautifully amenable at once to authority and temptation. No doubt the lads of the day might be more modest in discussion, just as a kitten might be more sober in its gambols; but in both cases restraint takes away all vivacity, and grace, and naturalness from their movements. *No doubt it is a bore, a very great bore, for a mature man to be overwhelmed in conversation by the dogmatism of boys; but that is a penalty we may surely endure for the sake of the outspoken frankness which endurance produces.* The intellectual vice of this generation has been, and to a less extent is still, over-reticence, an

should they not have the right to vote in order to manifest this consent? Where would your country be without children? Soon there would be no government at all, which cannot be said of the negroes, or of the foreign immigrants.

Certainly the distinguished New York editor, who is said to have "progressed" in his "radicalism" to the extent of advocating universal suffrage, "without regard to age, sex, or color," is at least a consistent man, whether or not he be a wise one.

In conclusion, I will recapitulate the chief positions that I have endeavored to enforce:

1. That voting, when the voter constitutes one of the majority, is an act of ruling, governing.

2. That the right to govern, not only yourselves, but other men, must, in justice to them, be based upon the possession, in a reasonable degree, of the ability to govern wisely and well.

3. That if too large a proportion of ignorant or worthless men be allowed to vote, the result will be the gradual deterioration, and, finally, the utter ruin of our republican system.

In every great movement, as History warns us, it is all-important that the party of Progress should know where to stop. Generally, misled by zealots, they will not pause at the proper period, and thus create a Reaction, whose waves in turn sweep away not

apparent acquiescence in statements and opinions secretly disbelieved, and it is owing principally to the relaxation in the relations of parent and child that it will not be the vice of the next."

only the proofs of their folly, but much which has really been gained for the great cause of human improvement. A safe rule in such cases would seem to be, that the reformatory party should pause when the result which they had originally aimed at was attained.

The Anti-slavery movement has effected its contemplated end; and the work planned in the days of sober reason being accomplished, it is now plunging into madness and folly. I warn the friends of the negro, and the negroes themselves, against the inevitable reaction which they are provoking. If they fall into the spirit of the Jacobins, and yield themselves up to wild theories of the natural rights of man, and wild notions of vengeance against the southern rebels, they will experience the fate of the Jacobins, and go down amid the fierce surges of a popular reaction. If they act, however, like moderate and sensible men, who are able to understand that there are other people in this country than negroes, and other interests than those relating to the freedmen, it will be well for the negroes themselves, for the Republican party, and for the country.

FEMALE SUFFRAGE.

ANY essay upon the subject of the suffrage, would seem at the present time to be incomplete, which did not take into consideration the expediency of conferring the elective franchise upon women.

It would be very unfair to regard the ladies who figure so prominently in "Woman's Rights'" conventions as representatives of more than a very small minority of the women of our land, but as those constituting this small minority are evidently very much in earnest, and as people who are not answered are apt to think that they cannot be answered, let us consider briefly the principal arguments upon which they rely.

The common argument as to "the consent of the governed," I have already disposed of. The people of the United States do "consent," male and female, with very few exceptions, to this government, which does not give women the right to vote. Therefore, having the "consent" of the great majority of the governed, we have the argument on this point until that "consent" is withdrawn.

All that I have said also relative to the alleged natural right to vote, and in proof of there being

no such natural right, unless indeed the right to govern may be said to be a natural right, based upon the possession of wisdom and virtue, applies to the claims of these female "reformers."

The whole question therefore comes down to this: would it be better for the community and the state (woman herself being regarded as a portion of the community and state) that women should vote?

Now this question involves the whole subject of the difference of sex. It also involves the expediency of giving the suffrage to as large a class as the whole number now exercising it, which class is, to a great extent, profoundly ignorant of all the industrial and financial questions with which government has so much to do.

It is not many months since the present writer listened to an "able lecturer," who informed his lady hearers that it was not only their right but their duty to vote. He said, in substance, ah, if the women only voted, how short a time it would be before New York City would become quite a New Jerusalem—how intemperance, and impurity, and gambling, and prize-fighting, and everything else in the land that was bad, would soon be put an end to—for you know, the women! the women of the country would not tolerate the continuance of such things; and the millennium would begin about the same day that the first lady Congressman took her seat in the capitol at Washington. He also made certain not very clear allusions to some 3000 or 30,000 unmarried women somewhere or other—I think it was in New England—and how that also was to be rectified. But as he did not go into particulars on this point, I suppose it was to be on the old "vote yourself a farm" principle—the change being made to suit the emergency, to "vote yourself a husband."

Now certainly nothing could have been better adapted to take with a certain class of ladies, and enlist them for the moment on the side of voting, than this prospect of bringing about the millennium.*

But it has become my duty to dash this charming picture to the ground. I assure my lady readers that one of the first things that sensible men learn in their political experience, is the little moral good that can be attained by mere force of legislative enactments.

Intemperance, impurity, gambling, and a brood of kindred vices, never have been cured, never will be cured, by force of law. The Puritans of England once tried that process, and the result was an immense amount of canting and hypocrisy, followed by the openly licentious reign of Charles the Second. It was never intended that vice should be thus extinguished. I say this with proper humility, because if

* Mrs. E. Cady Stanton, in a recent lecture said, according to the report in the *New York Tribune*:

"If the women of the State could only be galvanized into a consciousness of their true position, no longer would crimes, so often incited by women, fill our prisons. All these wrongs we see on every side are subjects of legislation, to be voted up or voted down."

it had been, the Creator would have acted on the same principle himself, and neither created man with a tendency to excess, nor endowed him with free agency. Wise men have learned that so long as a man's vices only affect himself—so long as the free agency of others is not invaded — it is generally better for the law-maker not to interfere. Men naturally, and therefore rightly, resent any interference with their personal freedom, which is the direct consequence of that free agency which is the gift of God. Even in such a matter as the so-called abolition of lotteries, it is questionable whether any good has been done, for the lotteries, secret and open, are probably as numerous as ever, while they are more unfair.

Now, if women wish to work against any of the moral evils and vices of society, they can find in the churches, the schools, the charitable and moral-reform associations, and, more than in all else, in the bosom of their own families, plenty of room for the exercise of all their energies were they tenfold as active and powerful. In moulding the minds of the young especially, they can do more good, real, lasting good, than by centuries of voting.

"But why not vote also?" For one reason, because you have not time and energy for everything, and it is better that you should devote them to duties which Providence, by making you women, has clearly designed you should primarily attend to. It is self-evident, for instance, that the mother, after her child is born, is the proper person to nurse and take the

chief care of it. The care of the home, and of the young children, naturally go together, and fall to the lot of the mother. In the case of the single woman, she as naturally helps, or should help, in most cases, some overburdened mother with the cooking, the care of the children, the sewing, the housework.

Now, except in revolutionary times, which are fortunately exceptional, the questions which politics have generally to do with, are questions of trade, and commerce, and finance, and war, which have a natural and direct relation to the common business pursuits and employments of men as manufacturers, tradesmen, farmers, seamen, and soldiers.

There may be a few women who naturally take an interest in questions of trade, finance, and internal improvements, and in political disquisitions and national constitutions; but for ninety-nine women in every hundred such questions have no interest. And when it comes to the claim of *universal* suffrage for women, it is not only a question as to whether a few ladies of peculiar talent and culture should vote, but whether the large masses of women, who, intelligent upon other subjects, have no liking for the usual political ones—and, to add to these, your cook and your house-maid, Bridget, and Judy, and Dinah, and the large class of ignorance which they represent—shall all be plunged into the political hodge-podge, to make confusion worse confounded.

So far from finding fault with the general ignorance of women on political questions, I regard it as being productive of great good to society. It fits woman for being what she otherwise, from her pecu-

liarly sensitive and impulsive temperament, could not easily be, a Peace-maker. Our present national convulsions, agitating society to its very centre, have had, in my opinion, a peculiarly unhappy effect upon our women. Just to think of it—a whole country of angry, warring men, and the women in the two sections the most extreme, the most relentless, the most unforgiving, the most blood-thirsty! Both as to the women of the North and of the South, I fear this is the simple truth, though, of course, both Northerners and Southerners can gild the hard, ugly fact with some pretty, patriotic name.

We have had the most exciting political controversies in times that are past, and will have them again, upon such questions, and I admit their importance—for what touches a man's means of living touches his life—upon such questions as a National Bank, a Protective Tariff, and Internal Improvements by the general government. Masses of men have been, will be again, excited almost to blows upon subjects like these. Now, the women of the country, being outside of politics, have always preserved a moderate state of feeling upon them, and been able to act as the continual peace-makers of the land. Mr. A. and Mr. B. might be ready to fight about a bank or a tariff, but Mrs. A. and Mrs. B., who thought comparatively little upon the subject, preserved the peace between the two families; and when the political excitement had lulled or passed away, soon brought their respective husbands around to the old point of intimacy or friendship. If the ladies had been voters,

and had attended political meetings, and their feelings had once become enlisted, they probably would have quarreled even more bitterly than their husbands, and the quarrel would have been lasting.

Again; there are other interests in society—especially the Fine Arts, Music, and Literature—which ought to claim a fair share of the common attention. Under the present system, except in very troublous times, the female portion of the community acts as a breakwater against the overflowing and tumultuous sea of politics. "Do talk of something else besides those everlasting politics!" says the fair queen of the evening; and the gentlemen, who have only been talking politics all day, are compelled to turn their thoughts into new fields, alike to the good of their own minds, and to the healthfulness of their political views, in danger of becoming morbid from too much thought and warmth. The ladies thus stop the politics, and will have music, will have dancing, will have games, nonsense, wit, repartee, and flirting. And in thus acting out their feminine natures, are doing tenfold more good to the gentlemen, to society, and even to legislation itself, than if they all went regularly to the "Woman's Rights' Society," "voted your mother-in-law," as old Weller says, "in the chair," and passed resolutions expressive of their high admiration for the reformatory shepherd with the red nose, or their fervent opinion that the gentleman with the black face was even more remarkable for his beauty, virtues, and general intelligence, than his whiter brother.

I am thus decidedly of the opinion that the Creator made no mistake in making women just what they are. Of course He could have made them—and our education and social influence can, if we see fit, partly make them—a kind of cross between man and woman, possessing the faults of both, and the virtues of neither.

I have sometimes thought that the true origin of this woman's rights and voting movement, is to be found in a secret over-admiration of man, and contempt for the peculiar nature and organization of woman. If its leaders were Grecian women of the olden time, I could imagine them complaining to Jupiter that he had created them women, and not that nobler being, man. "Woman is nothing, O Jupiter! she cannot fight, she cannot command armies, she cannot legislate, she cannot vote. She must stay at and revolve around home, because thou hast appointed her to bear, and nurse, and tend, and educate children. O Jupiter, let us no longer belong to the sex of whose career and destiny we are ashamed; but let us henceforth be men, and legislators, and warriors!"*

What a blessing it would be if Jupiter would only hear the secret prayer of such women. They do not perceive that as a general thing, they now succeed in making so much noise simply because they are women, and on the common reputation of the very sex whose

* See the "Anti-offspring Movement," in Appendix.

natural functions and sphere they in their hearts despise. If they were men, nobody would pay much attention to them, and they would, being well let alone, grow wiser.

I say you may spoil a woman by attempting to make her a man in character, but you cannot make her a man. The Roman ladies, we are told, once got up such a great admiration for beards that they began by the use of unguents, and by constant shaving, to try to raise beards of their own. They succeeded in spoiling their clean, smooth faces, but they raised very indifferent beards. So if you put a woman to what is by nature man's work, either in the physical or the intellectual world, you spoil her beautiful feminine characteristics of soul and body, and generally get rather indifferent work.

Neither does the motive with which the thing is done make any great difference. It may be the best and most justifiable motive in the world, but it will make little difference in the result. Her nature will be

> "Subdued
> To what it works in, like the dyer's hand."

It may be a mother toiling for her children, a daughter for her aged father. She may be walking in the path of a stern and inevitable duty, but not the less will the unwomanly occupation tell upon her body and her mind. And therefore it is to be greatly regretted, when the hard misfortunes of life compel a woman—as of course she may be compelled—into

unfeminine means of obtaining a living. A sad thing it is when such a necessity occurs.*

But the possession of the suffrage by women is supposed by many of the "Female Reformers" to be not only capable of effecting great changes in morals, but also to be a sure remedy for deficient work and wages. Thus a lady correspondent of the *New York Independent*, who writes in some respects like an intelligent woman, says:

"How many doors to remunerative employments would be thrown open to woman if she had the ballot! How politicians would interest themselves in finding places for her! The statute books of many of the States would no longer be disgraced by laws in regard to the disposition of property after the death of the husband;† and, strangest of all, women

* In illustration, for instance, of the effect produced upon a woman by a soldier's life, we quote the following from a newspaper:

"A Mrs. Frances F. S—— is now in Washington applying at the Pay Department for back pay for services in the Western armies as a cavalryman. She says she enlisted in 1861 with her husband in the Thirteenth Missouri Cavalry, and fought for two years as a cavalryman in our armies. She fought under Grant, Sheridan, and Rosecrans. She was in the battle of Shiloh, or Pittsburg Landing, and Stone River, and at the latter battle her husband was killed and she severely wounded. Her sex thus became known, and she was discharged the service. She has married since, and is now endeavoring to get the pay due her when discharged. Mrs. S—— has evidently seen hard service in camp or elsewhere, and *has contracted all the airs, attitude, and manners of a man. She wears a Scotch cap, cocked on one side of her head, chews tobacco, and smokes.* She is accompanied by her present husband."

† It is not necessary that the women should vote in order to have unjust laws altered, as the recent alteration of the laws in several of the Northern States has proven. As soon as there is a demand on the part of the women of any State for the amendment of an unjust law, such alteration, judging the future by the past, will be cheerfully made.

would begin to acquire property by their own labor, and not be compelled, as is too often the case now, to marry a man they do not love for the sake of having a home."

And Mrs. E. Cady Stanton, in a lecture at Brooklyn, is reported in the *New York Tribune* as saying:

"Shall Senators tell me in their places that I have no need of the ballot when 40,000 women in the City of New York alone are earning their daily bread at starving prices with the needle, and below these, in the lower depths, are a mighty multitude over whose follies and crimes society draws the veil of forgetfulness, or before that inscrutable problem stands hardened and appalled!"

Now a better acquaintance with the principles of political economy would have taught both these ladies that the evils of which they complain are only partially within the proper sphere of legislation, and that the direct interference of the state with the complicated question of work and wages is quite as apt to result in harm as in good.

I may be allowed, on account of the great importance of this subject, to state briefly what I consider the true causes of the low price at which woman's labor is frequently held.

There is little doubt that, in a proper arrangement of society, nearly every woman would be some man's wife. Even as society is, the great majority of

women become wives and mothers. And owing to this being the natural destiny, if I may use the term, of woman, every young girl hopes to be some man's wife, and every mother hopes to see her daughter in such a position.

Hoping and expecting this, the daughter strives to fit herself for a wife's and mother's duties; and the parents aid her in so doing.

Now, this study of sewing, cookery, and housekeeping—which also generally comes in very opportunely to aid the mother in her numerous cares—occupies a large share of the daughter's time and energy in the hours not devoted to her necessary schooling. She grows older, and perhaps leaves school, but still, in the middle and higher classes of society, devotes time to music, and, perhaps, the languages, — these studies being followed for two reasons: first, to fit her to perform her part as mistress of a home; secondly, as offering a means of support in after-life, in case it should become necessary for her to support herself.*

* Of the amount of thought and knowledge required for the proper performance of a country housekeeper's functions, Mrs. Daniel Rice gives a fair summary in an essay read before the Farmers' Club, of Springfield, Vermont. She says:

"Did you ever think of the amount of thought requisite to plan three meals a day for three hundred and sixty-five days in succession? To prepare enough and not too much, and, for those living at a distance from the village, to remember that the stock of flour, sugar, tea, etc., etc., is replenished in due time? Do you ever think of the multitude of a farmer's wife's cares and duties? She must rise early to prepare breakfast or oversee it. Perhaps there are children to wash, dress, and feed, or to get ready for school with their dinners. There is baking, sweeping, dusting, making beds, lunch for the men, may be—dinner and supper to be made ready at the proper time—the washing, starching, folding and ironing of clothes—the care of milk, including the making of butter and cheese—and the inevitable washing of dishes. In autumn there is the additional work of picking, preserving, canning of fruit, drying apples, boiling cider, making apple-sauce, with the still more unpleasant task which falls to her lot at butchering time. Then there is haying, harvesting, sheep-shearing, etc., when more help is needed, bringing an increase of her labors. Twice a year comes house-cleaning. By-the-way, of all the foes a housekeeper has to contend with, dirt is the greatest. She may gain a complete victory and think to repose upon her laurels after her semi-annual engagements, but it is only temporary. The enemy soon returns, and even daily skirmishing does not keep it at bay. There is the mending, too. Sewing machines are great blessings, but they can't set in a patch or darn the stockings. I do not mention these things by way of complaining of woman's lot in general, or asking for her any rights which she does not possess. I don't know as there is any remedy in the present state of the world. It seems to be one of the evils of life which must be borne as we bear other ills; but what I do ask is a due appreciation of the important part that woman acts, and a concession that her labors, mental and physical, are as great, all things considered, as those of the other sex. Women are not so childish that a little sympathy now and then, or acknowledgment of their efforts and sacrifices, makes them imagine their case worse than it is. I tell you, men and husbands, 'It doeth good like a medicine,' and many a poor, crushed, broken-down wife and mother is dying for want of it."

It is because either the husband or the wife *must* stay at home and manage the house and young children, and that, in the order of nature, it is evidently the wife whose place it is to do this—that the son is educated with a direct reference to business and

money-making, and the daughter with a main reference to filling the position of wife and housekeeper and educator at home.

When we come to the practical working of things, as we all know, the great majority of women do marry, and fill, some of them luxurious, many of them comfortable, and others of them poverty-stricken homes. In some cases the husband dies, and leaves his wife, burdened with children, to struggle on alone, sometimes that struggle being lightened by the aid of kind relatives, while at other times she is entirely unfriended and unhelped.

In the cases of those women who do not marry, and who have to depend upon their own exertions for a support, as well as in the case of poor widows, there are only comparatively a few avocations outside of sewing and housekeeping which are open to them.

Why is this? Partly because of their education having been such as has been stated; mainly because of their peculiar bodily characteristics as women. A man has the choice of many trades; or, if he has no trade, can, as a last resort, take to his mere brute strength, and become a porter, or a soldier, or a common laborer in a manufactory, on board a ship, or on a farm. In this country there is seldom a time that a single man cannot find employment somewhere, in the West if not in the East, although there is many a time that a married man, burdened with a family, and chained down thus to a single spot, scarcely knows where or how to get the next meal's

victuals for the little mouths at home. Ask men who are in a position to know, and they will tell you of hundreds and thousands of cases in which intelligent men, living in our large cities, have come to them and fairly begged to be employed, at any price, so that they might keep, not themselves, but the dear ones at home from starving. Ask even among your own gentlemen acquaintances, ladies, with whom you can talk in confidence, and you will be surprised to hear how many of them, in the course of their lives, have been almost on the brink of utter want, and would have welcomed death gladly as a relief from the intense agony of their position, if it had brought with it a prospect of relief for the little ones so inexpressibly dear.

Ladies, we men are not great talkers about such private matters, else we might often say to those who declaim so wildly about the wrongs and sufferings of women, in language similar to that of the Mexican king: "Are we on a bed of roses?"

Women, for the reason I have given, not having been apprenticed when young to the lighter trades, and their physical constitution, both in its weakness and its refinement, unfitting them for the heavier ones, resort, when they are compelled to support themselves, to such occupations as sewing, teaching, factory work, the lighter and more easily acquired trades, and to domestic service.

Now it will be noticed that for single women especially, there is no want of employment in this country. Any woman, capable or incapable, can always

find employment at domestic service, if everything else fails her. And this shows how nonsensical, as well as mischievous, the pathetic stories are that we sometimes hear—such, for instance, as one the talented and eloquent Miss Dickinson is in the habit of telling—in which a beautiful young girl goes to moral ruin to keep herself from starvation. The interesting young girl in question could have gone to any intelligence office in Philadelphia, and been engaged for good wages at service in a respectable family in twenty-four hours. Every housekeeper knows this.

One reason of the low wages given to women is to be found in the fact that the supply so often exceeds the demand. The employments that women are fitted by nature to follow being comparatively few, they crowd the avenues to these, with the single exception, as I have said, of domestic service. This last, although peculiarly woman's work in the economy of the world, she generally avoids when there is any possibility of doing so. There is a continual demand, both in the East and in the West, and especially in the latter, for good domestic help—wives and mothers, by the tens of thousands, asking for single women, who are in want of employment, to come and help them, and thus ease their heavy burdens; but to this demand, notwithstanding all the outcry about women not being able to find employment, there is never any adequate response.

If this demand for domestic service were met, it would not only be a work of philanthropy to the thousands of overworked wives and mothers, but it

would probably so lessen the number of women who now seek employment as teachers, sewing women, factory operatives, etc., that the wages of these latter would speedily advance to a nearer approximation to those of men. But there seems to be a prejudice against domestic service, as a low and servile occupation, which leads many to content themselves with a mere pittance as sewing women, when they could get a comfortable living and good wages as cook, child's nurse, or chamber-maid.

The proportion of trades for which women are unfitted, by reason of their physical organization, is larger than many suppose. By the last census—that of 1860—we find that the number of occupations in the United States and Territories, is set down as 586, employing 8,224,171 persons. In addition, 62,872 persons were enrolled as either engaged in other occupations, or whose occupations were unknown.

The principal occupations, however, are only 73 in number, giving employment to 7,415,900 persons, or nearly eight out of every nine of the employed. Now of these 73 principal occupations, 43, employing the large number of 5,506,800 persons, are evidently unsuited for women, as will be seen by the following list:

Farmers (omitting 85,000 planters)	2,423,000	Fishermen	21,000
Farm laborers	795,000	Gardeners	21,000
Laborers	969,000	Lumbermen	15,000
Carpenters	243,000	Moulders	17,000
Blacksmiths	112,000	Coach-makers	19,000
Miners	147,000	Stone-cutters	19,000
Painters	51,000	Tinsmiths	17,000
Coopers	43,000	Peddlers	16,000
Machinists	43,000	Railroadmen	36,000
Mariners	67,000	Plasterers	13,000
Masons	48,000	Sawyers	15,000
Wheelwrights	32,000	Ship-carpenters	13,000
Teamsters	34,000	Saddlers	12,000
Mechanics	23,000	Tanners and Curriers	10,000
Millers	37,000	Steamboatmen	7,000
Lawyers	33,000	Ostlers	8,000
Butchers	30,000	Porters	6,000
Engineers	27,000	Watchmen and Messengers	4,500
Cabinet-makers	29,000	Wood-cutters	3,300
Brickmakers and Bricklayers	27,000		
Carters	21,000		5,506,800

Now for all the above avocations woman is unfitted by her physical weakness,—even many men are not strong enough for carpenters, blacksmiths, etc.,—as well as by that delicacy and refinement of organization which it should be the object of society to preserve. I admit that necessity has no law but its own stern decrees, and yet the fact remains, that a woman cannot become a laborer in the fields, a carpenter, blacksmith, miner, mason, mariner, butcher, bricklayer, carter, stone-cutter, ostler, etc., without losing that delicacy and fineness of organization which is the peculiar charm of her sex.

The chief employments of women, *and which women alone follow*, would seem to be the seven following:

Seamstresses	90,000	Milliners	25,000
Laundresses	38,000	Nurses	8,000
Mantua-makers	35,000	Shoebinders	3,500
Housekeepers	22,000		
			221,500

To the above we may add sixteen occupations that men and women share between them:

Servants	560,000	Tobacconists	21,000
Tailors and Tailoresses	101,000	Spinners	9,000
Clerks	184,000	Bookbinders	6,000
Shoemakers	164,000	Musicians	4,700
Teachers	110,000	Music-teachers	5,600
Factory hands	87,000	Telegraph operators	2,000
Printers	23,000	Trimmers	3,800
Merchants, Storekeepers, and Traders	142,000	Upholsterers	3,000
			1,426,100

And to these we may add six occupations which although at present, if I am not mistaken, nearly entirely filled by men, might perhaps be partly filled to advantage by women:

Physicians	56,000	Hatters	11,000
Clergymen	37,000	Weavers	36,000
Bakers	19,000	Watch-makers	4,500
			161,500

I have added physicians and clergymen to this list because the female lecturers contend strongly that women are qualified to fill both positions. So far as physic is concerned, while I see not only no sacrifice of womanly delicacy, but even the reverse, in a woman's ministering as a physician to other women in many classes of cases, I do not think that the general practice of a physician, especially in country districts, is at all suitable for the sex. As

to the ministerial profession, as it involves peculiarities of religious belief, and does not affect my argument in any great degree, I express no opinion upon it.

We have thus 43 leading occupations, employing 5,506,800 persons, which are entirely unsuited to women, against 7, employing only 221,500 persons, which are confined exclusively to them. We have besides 22 occupations, employing 1,587,600 persons, which are either suitable alike to both sexes, or partly suitable to one sex and partly to the other. Now, if we suppose that women can properly find employment in these 22 latter occupations to half the whole number of workers required, we have a demand in these employments for 793,800 persons; which, added to the requirements of the 7 occupations that are confined exclusively to women, make a demand on the whole for 1,015,300 women, against a demand for 6,300,600 men.

I think it will appear from a study of these simple facts, that were it not for the continual large call upon the female sex for wives and mothers, the supply of female labor in all the other occupations at all suitable for women, would so press upon the demand, that not only would the wages paid women be greatly reduced, but thousands would be compelled to resort to field labor, to mining, to brickmaking, to anything that would afford the barest maintenance.

Do any of our female "Reformers" ever think what it is that induces a man to take upon himself the care and burden of a wife and family? A man

can make a great deal more money when his yearly expenses are only one-half, or one-fourth, or one-tenth. A large family of children is often the bar between poverty with its numberless privations, and wealth, with its numberless enjoyments. As a well-to-do bachelor a man can live luxuriously, travel, be an object of special attention and flattery in every social circle, have pretty women hanging on every word of his wonderful lips, taste, with a single exception, every cup of joy that the world affords.

Why then does a man marry? Some wit has defined matrimony to be "the insane desire of a young man to pay a young woman's board." It is generally not because he needs a housekeeper—it is generally because some woman, by her feminine grace or beauty or sparkle, inflames his imagination and his heart, and makes him think life worthless apart from her.

If women did not carefully preserve the peculiar charms of the feminine nature—if, with the idea of making money, or acquiring fame, they allowed the down of their peach, the fresh dew of their rose to be brushed off and dried up in the paths of business and trade—they would find that the number of marriages would rapidly decrease.

How to make marriage as near as possible universal, is a question of great importance, to women especially. Men can get along without marriage, after a fashion. Women cannot.* Therefore, as it appears to

* A lady in whose judgment I have a great deal of confidence, says that this is not so—and, moreover, that it will offend women

me, wise women should set their faces steadily against any ideas and practices which tend to unsex woman, on the one side; and against the extravagance to which our social life is tending on the other. Let the young men see women that will attract them, and let them see, in the second place, that these women will be satisfied with an economical and moderate style of living. If parents have large means, let their property not be wasted in costly jewelry and silks and laces, and in expensive living, but let it be reserved to settle a larger or smaller sum upon the daughters as well as upon the sons when they make their start in life. Many are the cases in which young men are deterred from marriage, not because they do not love, but because they cannot

generally. I have had no idea of offending women in this essay—or of pleasing them—my sole idea has been to state what I thought the truth. Perhaps, however, my meaning may not be correctly understood. I mean simply to say that the poets are not altogether wrong when they tell us, in varied phrases, that

> "Man's love is of his life a thing apart—
> 'Tis woman's whole existence."

And that the physiologists also are not far out of the way, when they say that marriage is more important to woman than to man, because she has three natural functions to perform in matrimony, where he has only one. I therefore give it as my *belief*—not pretending to be infallible—that the fact is as I state it; that women do miss the natural ties of love and home and offspring more than men. And that, moreover, men are able to find a solace in the pursuit of wealth and of fame, in seamanship and war, in adventures on land and sea, which, as a general thing, is denied to woman.

hope to keep the lady as she has been used to living in her father's house. And so the young man lives on a bachelor—becoming more and more selfish every day—and the woman, having none of the blessed cares which nature intended she should have, becomes unhealthy and unhappy; and either comforts herself with the religious conviction that this world was designed to be a state of pain and probation, or else makes up her mind that her sex is in some way or other greatly injured and oppressed.*

Ladies, in talking so much, and often so selfishly,

* It is probable that the excess of females over males in the New England States, and the consequent large number of unmarried women, has something to do with the wild ideas which spring up like weeds in that portion of the Union. In Massachusetts, for instance, there are 37,600 more females than males.

As to the proportion of the marriageable persons in the United States who do not marry, we are only able to approximate to it. Mr. Kennedy, in his introduction to the last census, says: "Very full statistics of marriages have been collected in the different countries of Europe, a leading indication of which may thus be stated: out of every 21 persons above the age of 18 years, 11 are married, 3 have been so, and 7 are unmarried. Or, eleven are living in marriage, the twelfth is a widower, the thirteenth and fourteenth are widows, and the remaining *seven* have never been married." Now, if we suppose that the discouragements to marriage in Europe from the large liability to military service, and from slender means, counterbalance the discouragements here from the excess of 730,000 males, distributed mainly in the Western States and Territories, we may conclude that fully *one-third* of our male and female population within the marriageable ages, remain unmarried all their lives. A fact which needs the attention of sensible men and women far more than three-fourths of the questions which absorb in their turn the public mind.

about your rights, do you not see you may make men more selfish than they are? If the sexes are equal in the meaning of being alike, is not all that fine American sense of respect and even reverence for woman, which strikes travelers so curiously, a piece of nonsense and folly? If you insist upon equality of rights, you may get more equality than will be pleasant to you—such equality as puts woman to making roads and digging ditches in France and Germany, and unconcernedly allows women to stand while men sit even in England. Carry out the idea of equality of rights, as understood by the "Woman's Rights' Societies," and see how long these gentle courtesies which now sweeten and exalt our manners will endure.

But, to return to the subject of wages, another reason of the poor wages given to sewing and other women, is the fact that so many of them do such poor work. It is like the case of the minister who was condoled with by a friend for the very small salary he received. The minister was at least honest. "Yes," he said, "it is very poor pay, but then it is very poor preach." A good dress-maker or tailoress in New York or Philadelphia cannot only get good wages, but has generally to be engaged by her customers about six months in advance. A good nurse is not only well paid, but she also is difficult to secure at all. A capable lady lecturer, or writer, or artist is apt to receive even more than a man of the same amount of capacity. Anna Dickinson, Ristori, Rosa Bonheur, Harriet Hosmer all receive

better pay than would be given to men of equal ability. Womanhood commands a premium often of itself—as manhood often does of itself. And the scale does not so frequently turn in favor of the man as our lady reformers seem to imagine. Where women compete with men, and their qualifications are equal, the general law in this country, I should say, was to give them the preference.*

This would seem to be in conformity with the chivalric code of female precedence, which obtains not only in matters of little importance, as some may consider them, such as the right to the best seats at a lecture, in a car or stage or steamboat, the best rooms in a hotel, the only seats at a ball or party, and which really do involve a great amount of personal comfort and enjoyment, but in matters even of life and death. For in the case of leaving a wreck at sea, the same rule holds, even if the vessel be going down. And so as to the perils of war; the man meets them, the woman is shielded by her sex. In one word, the man takes the front, if discomfort or danger is before; the rear, if it is behind.

In social life, a young lady, with nothing else than beauty and wit and womanhood to recommend her, may become a power; may, besides, have opportunity after opportunity to become the respected head of an opulent home. While the young man, her brother, and just as handsome for a man, and just as intelli-

* See "Room Higher Up," an article from the New York *Independent*, in Appendix.

gent and spirited, is comparatively a nobody. Young ladies frequently have gone to Washington, for instance, and in a month or two have become acquainted with the leading statesmen of the country; so well acquainted, in fact, that they really possessed and could exert, if they chose, considerable influence. Their brothers go to Washington, and are nothing. In all these cases, the mere fact of womanhood insures superior pleasure, safety, position, and power.*

But not even women can avoid the sad necessity of taking the bitter with the sweet. Their lot has its peculiar trials and inconveniences, as well as its peculiar felicities. Just as they have the almost unequaled bliss of maternity, and the often terrible pain of child-bearing.

I do not see anything better, therefore, than to educate our girls and young women with a reference to what we hope they may become: the beloved wives of honorable and noble men, the happy mothers of beautiful children, the venerated mistresses of comfortable homes. If we can add to this education some insight into and mastery over occupations which are in demand, and thus increase their chances of employment, if they should be thrown hereafter upon their own resources, of course it will be all the better.

* The English traveler, Hepworth Dixon, in his recent book, speaking of an incident which happened to him and his companion in the West, says: "We look at each other wonderingly, for, in this paradise of women, a petticoat is accustomed to carry all things before it—the best room at a hotel, the highest place at table, the first seat in a coach, in spite of your prior right."—*New America*, p. 32.

Health must, however, be secured in the first place; no matter what a woman or a man is to be, there is no success possible without bodily health and vigor. After this should come as good and complete an intellectual education as possible. How to make bread, cook a dinner, and do general housework are, perhaps, of even more importance. Then sewing, which should include a knowledge of how to make their own dresses and their own bonnets. Music is desirable, and dancing, which, including the fancy dances, is often better than calisthenics for exercise, and the promotion of bodily grace and vigor.

Saying we have done all this, and our daughters do not marry, must they remain idly at home? I think not. Unless their duties at home are such as to satisfy them, let them seek elsewhere for any occupation that becomes a woman. Let them obtain employment as servants, factory-hands, milliners, dress-makers, teachers, clerks, housekeepers, singers, artists, writers, physicians to their own sex—even lecturers and ministers in those exceptional cases where nature has given them the peculiar gifts required. And should a woman who is exceptionally made in her physical organization, determine to become a blacksmith, a stone-mason, or a teamster, I would not put a bar in her way. Exceptional cases would seem to have exceptional rights. But I would not by the enactment of any general law, or by the force of general education, encourage or train up other women to follow her example. Thus, if a woman felt a great interest in political questions, such

as those of Free Trade and the Currency, I would find no fault with her lecturing or writing upon those subjects, but I would not confer the right of suffrage upon all her sex, in order that she might be allowed to vote; for that would be, in its practical workings, to *force* women in general into the political arena, and out of their appropriate sphere.

The advocates of the rights of women should remember that the lower rate at which women generally are paid has at least this advantage, that it opens to the sex new avenues of employment. No man will pay six dollars for that which he can get for five. When men receive higher wages than women, it is because the employer thinks they are worth the difference. It is thus that as teachers, women are continually supplanting men; and the same is true of other avocations. There is no eloquence of a Woman's Rights' advocate equal to the eloquence of getting the same quantity and quality of work for a smaller sum of money.

But the employer also knows that what is less in price is often really the dearer of the two. If he wants skill, he knows that women are apt to fail, because their liability to become wives at any moment, and thus be withdrawn from the business, renders them less determined than men to perfect themselves. Besides, if the man marries, he will stick closer to his trade than ever, and be a more reliable workman; while the woman will abandon the trade, and thus much labor that her employer may have bestowed upon her to teach her his peculiar ways and

increase her skill, be wasted. All such considerations affect the value and wages of labor.

I contend, therefore, that the extension of the suffrage to woman would neither increase her wages, nor open new avenues of employment to her, except as it tended to divert her energies from those congenial fields of duty which her peculiar organization, physical, mental, and spiritual, fits her for, to employ them upon those which by the same great law of mental and physical organization are peculiarly the sphere and business of man. And that by so doing, not only would woman's appropriate work in this world suffer, but man's would suffer also.

The field of labor and knowledge is so wide already—while with every year it is becoming wider—that it is impossible for human beings with only the average amount of time and energy to compass it all. In labor, as also in knowledge, there are certain great branches which naturally appertain to man, and other great branches which as naturally appertain to woman. That a woman cannot become a carpenter, a blacksmith, a laborer in the fields, a seaman, a soldier, without injury to the gracefulness and delicacy of her physical organization, is a fact which few will deny. And, as I have already said, it matters not what the motives are which induce or compel her to such employments—the laws of the physical world make no allowance for motives. And such employments, moreover, not only make the female body coarser, they also affect the mind, both by reason of the natural sympathy between the two,

and on account of the frequent sacrifice of womanly delicacy which they generally compel.*

* Dr. Morrill Wyman, of Cambridge, Mass., in a pamphlet relative to the recent case of girl-whipping in that place, sets forth the difference between the two sexes as follows:

"Physiologically she is different, and to this I would most earnestly beg your attention. Her blood corpuscles are smaller, her nervous system is of a more delicate structure, her brain is lighter, and her muscles smaller; she is made for quickness and vivacity, but not for strength and endurance. The same reasons which prevent her from sharing the rougher games and plays of boys, should protect her from suffering the harsher punishment of boys.

"She is more sensible to internal emotions and external sensations; and I assert, without fear of contradiction, that no physician can be safely trusted to advise for the preservation of health, or its restoration, who disregards even in the child the distinction of sex. The most eventful period of her physiological life is spent in schools. During this period there is not unfrequently mental uneasiness, irritability, and depression, easily mistaken for petulance and defiance by the unwise, and I greatly fear has sometimes produced punishment for that for which she is answerable to her God alone.

"Why should not girls be treated as boys? *Because girls are not boys.* Every parent having children of both sexes knows that they have moral characteristics which at once distinguish them before they arrive at the school age. They are weaker in body and more sensitive in feeling, and are more occupied with the impression they make upon others long before they know its value. That delicate sense of propriety which distinguishes the woman has already its germs in the girl. They seem to know instinctively that they cannot rely upon physical strength, and as instinctively cling to others for support and protection. They are gentle, docile, confiding, and affectionate. They exhibit these gentler qualities at home and in school in a thousand ways; they hasten to meet their teacher as she approaches in the morning; they run by her side, they seize her hand, and evince their affection by kisses upon her cheeks and roses upon her desk. The skillful and faithful teacher takes advantage of these qualities, especially of their docility, and so moulds them that corporal punishment is not only unnecessary, but it is cruelty.

"With a rapidity of development unknown in the other sex, she becomes a woman, with all a woman's refined sensibilities, hopes, and fears. She now instinctively knows that upon the good impression she makes upon others is based her hopes of the future. If her physical organization is sensitive, her spiritual nature is doubly sensitive, and it is this which makes her what she is.'

In the field of mental labor and culture it is the same. No woman who is also a woman in mind—no harmoniously framed example of her harmonious sex—naturally resorts to the more abstract and severe studies. In the exceptional cases where women do really enjoy such studies as political economy, finance, and the higher mathematics and sciences, we at once say, such a woman has a masculine mind—not meaning by the term a superiority of quality, but a difference in kind.

The field of labor and knowledge thus dividing itself naturally into man's work and woman's work, with a large space in addition, which is common to both parties, let each sex see that its own proper business is well done. In the rearing and educating of young children, the multitudinous cares of home, the ministering to the poor and infirm of the neighborhood, is a field of the utmost importance, and wide enough to employ the greater portion of the energy of the female sex. When that and the kin-

dred portions of the field sacred to woman's labor, shall be so well occupied that there is female energy to spare, it will be time enough for woman to enter that portion of the field which nature, the mother of custom, has peculiarly marked out for man. If the heavier trades, and commerce, and agriculture, and seamanship, and war, and the study of finance and government, and government itself, be not peculiarly the man's portion of work in the business of this world, then there is no real and vital difference in the physical and intellectual constitutions of men and women, and the race, from its very commencement, has been laboring under a profound delusion.

Is woman doing her own work well? We commend this question to our female conventionists. If she is not, would it not be wiser to direct their energies to the better management of their own peculiar business? Are the women of our land good housekeepers? How many of these female reformers can cook a good dinner, bake a light and sweet loaf of bread, properly rear a family of children, and make her own bonnet and her own dress? If they can do these things, and have so much unemployed time on their hands as the attendance of these numerous meetings and conventions would seem to imply, would it not be well to teach the tens of thousands of their ignorant sisters how to do them also?* Instead of complaining of the miserable wages paid to miserable

* Bad cookery in this country is almost universal—and is probably the source of half the intemperance, and half the disease.

workwomen, would it not be better to organize societies to teach these workwomen how to do better work, and thus enable them to secure better wages? I grant that it would not minister to vanity so much, it would not secure so much applause from a circle of foolish sisters, and more foolish brethren, but it would do vastly more good. And this is really what is wanted, and is a work that would absorb a large proportion of the female reformatory energy of the land.*

* The Philadelphia *Public Ledger*, of a recent date, says:

"There is in New York an admirable institution doing great good, with but a small expenditure of money, known as 'The Working Women's Protective Union.' It was some time ago organized by a few *gentlemen*, for the laudable purpose of improving the condition of the large class of females in New York who are dependent upon their industry for a livelihood. The object was to bring women and their work together, to inform females where they could procure respectable employment, and to inform employers where they could obtain the female help they may require. The necessity for an organization of this sort lies in the peculiar relations attending female employment. Respectable women and girls cannot (except at the risk of words and looks from which they would shrink as from a blow) go to workshops and ask for employment the same as men. They, therefore, rest under a double disadvantage—in not knowing where to find their work, or in being prevented from seeking it by the wretched standard of morals in many places of business, and also in the work not being able to find them. The Working Women's Protective Union was formed to remove these difficulties. It has an office at which women and girls are informed where and how they may obtain the employment for which they are best qualified, and employers can easily procure the kind of help they need. The society reports the following as the amount of wages generally earned by sewing-women during

Let our female reformers therefore, instead of concerning themselves so much with the shortcomings of their brethren, look at home. There will be found work for the balance of their earthly lives. We think we are not in error in asserting, that at present the average of the work done by women, is not equal to the average of that done by men—not that men's work is anything to boast of. Probably when these ladies have improved the working abilities of their sex, when they have taught the poor needle-women how to sew and make dresses, when they have taught Biddy and Judy how to cook and bake bread, when they have taught their own daughters also how to do these things, and moreover how to dress and to keep house economically, when they have taught women generally that there really is no degradation in domestic service, and that it is better to have a comfortable home and two dollars a week, than to do miser-

1866: cloakmakers, $8 per week; shirtmakers' operators, $7 to $8 per week; boys' clothing, $4 to $5 per week; cuff and collar operators, $8 to $9 per week; umbrella sewers, $5 per week; burnishers, $4 to $5 per week; military work, $4 to $5 per week; button-hole makers, $3 per week; dressmakers, $8 to $5 and $10 per week; fur sewers, $4 to $7 per week; machine operators, $7 to $10 per week; vestmakers $4 to $8 per week.

"It also reports that during the past year 8279 applicants were furnished with employment, the whole number applying being 13,177. In the same period 4216 women applied for and received information, advice, or friendly assistance in letter writing, etc., on matters not entirely connected with the pursuit of their respective branches of labor."

A somewhat similar institution, called the "Young Women's Christian Association," is in operation in Boston.

able needle-work and feed yourself at twenty-five cents a day—when they have done these greatly-needed things, a large proportion of the evils and sufferings of which they now bitterly complain will have disappeared. No doubt, however, there still will be plenty of suffering, for women as for men, from poverty, disease, and unhappy matrimonial relations. But the cure for these will seldom be found in the ballot-box, either in the case of man or of woman. As the poet says:

> "How small, of all that human hearts endure,
> That part which laws or kings can cause or cure!"

For law is apt to do even justice unjustly. It fosters one interest, but it crushes another. It rights one class, but it wrongs another class. It represses certain outward forms of vice and immorality, but the evil spirit adds hypocrisy and deceit to itself, and becomes more of a reprobate than before.

The most that men, as well as women, should generally ask of the law, is simply to be protected in their persons and property, and to be let alone. So far as any grievances in the laws relative to women have been pointed out, and urged upon our state legislatures, they have been cheerfully and promptly amended. In some instances these changes have left the law really unfair to man, even when looked at from the "woman's rights'" point of view. Where such amendments have not been made, it has simply been owing to the fact that not even a small minority have urged them. I think, for my own part, that the benefit derived from these changes has been very lit-

tle, as I think the evil laid to the laws as they previously stood was very much exaggerated. Still I favored the change. And if any further changes are demanded, let them be fairly weighed, and if at all just and reasonable—or even if not altogether unjust and unreasonable—be granted. But, apart from the demand for the suffrage, which is urged partly on the plea of procuring the change of unjust laws, I cannot see, after considerable reading of the proceedings of the reformatory conventions, that any specific law is complained of. There is a general complaint of injustice and oppression, but few specifications. What do you want, lady reformers? Do you wish, as some seem to, the right to keep your own family names, if you choose, when you marry? I see no great objection to allowing it? Do you wish your husbands to assume your names? I see no great objection to it, if they are willing. In fact, I think in the cases of some of you whom I could mention, did not courtesy forbid, there would be an obvious propriety in their so doing. Do you wish to hold property in your own name? A number of the states have already enacted this, and the others will do it, if their women desire them to. It is merely the allowing of that to be done directly, which has heretofore been done indirectly. Make your demands, ladies; come down to particulars, and let us hear what law it is of which you complain.*

* See Appendix for summary of "The Married Women's Acts."

But while legislators can alter laws, they cannot alter constitutional differences, and the customs reasonably based thereon. They cannot change men into women, or women into men. It is the Creator, and not human laws and customs, who is responsible for its being the portion of woman to bear and nurse and care for the young children of the land. You may esteem it, as the great majority of women do, an honor and a glory; or, as some of your own strong-minded class do, a penalty and a shame; it alters not the fact that the Creator has made it your special duty in this world. It may be, if the recent scientific theory of progressive development be true, that men, through the force of law and custom and constant trial, might be developed at least into a degree of nursing ability, in the course of some millions or billions or trillions of centuries; but a great deal of energy would be wasted in doing it, and the burden, after all, only be shifted, not destroyed. We think things are better arranged as they are; and, if not, the improved development would hardly be accomplished during the existence of this earthly sphere.

The undeniable fact that our legislative bodies have cheerfully made such changes in the laws as were asked for even by a small minority of women, proves how false is the assertion that it is necessary that women should vote, in order to have their just rights respected by law-makers and judges; as if men, especially American men, could not be trusted

to do simple justice to their own mothers and wives and sisters! If it had come to this, and the great majority of American women really believed this, marriage with them, in the high sense of the word, would be no longer possible, but only a sexual and household partnership.

But I should wrong the women of America even by supposing for a moment, that they could do such injustice in their hearts to their husbands and sons and fathers. It is only a few inharmoniously developed, or improperly educated, or unhappily circumstanced women who indulge in this general slander. Such women may be very intellectual, and yet, from a deficiency in their womanly nature, be very unsound in judgment upon all matters referring to the relations of the sexes. There is more good sense in the simple assertion of a true, harmoniously-proportioned woman, that she does not want any more rights than she already has, than in long columns of unsound reasoning and frothy declamation; for the simple perception of a large and well-balanced nature comes nearer the absolute truth than all the labored efforts of an unbalanced one. Intellect alone, in man or woman, can never discern high moral truth. And thus the simple instinct even of a woman who cannot give a reason, is often really worth more than all the long and distorted arguments of what is called, with a close approximation to the fact, a "strong-minded" woman; for this term "strong-minded" originates in a popular perception that in these women the reasoning portion of the nature is developed in excess—and excess in excess is monstrosity.

I would say, therefore, to the true women of America, have faith in your instincts. God might have made you men; but it is not your shame, but your glory, that He did make you women. Be not ashamed of your sex, its peculiar functions, its peculiar duties, its peculiar sphere. Still refuse, as you ever have refused, to injure the harmony and feminine beauty and gracefulness of your physical and spiritual organization by striving to be as men are, to do the things which men do, to compete for the peculiar prizes which men compete for. Your nature and functions and sphere are different. Let masculine women and feminine men admire each other, as they always have done. For you, be the admiration and love of all true men, by being yourselves distinctly and unequivocally, in body, mind, and spirit, in character and in sphere, true, feminine, graceful, and harmonious women.*

---

* As an illustration of the power for good which lies in simply being a graceful and refined woman, I quote the following from Hepworth Dixon's account of the mining City of Denver, in Colorado:

"If I may believe the witnesses, the advent of a dozen English and American ladies, who came out with their husbands, has done far more for Denver than the genius and eloquence of William Gilpin. A lady is a power in this country. From the day when a silk dress and a lace shawl were seen in Main Street, that thoroughfare became passably clean and quiet; oaths were less frequently heard; knives were less frequently drawn; pistols were less frequently fired. None of these things have

"For woman is not undeveloped man,
But diverse: could we make her as the man,
Sweet love were slain, whose dearest bond is this,
Not like to like, but like in difference:
Yet in the long years liker must they grow;
The man be more of woman, she of man;
He gain in sweetness and in moral height,
Nor lose the wrestling thews that throw the world;
She mental breadth, nor fail in childward care:
More as the double-natured Poet each:
Till at the last she set herself to man,
Like perfect music unto noble words;
And so these twain, upon the skirts of Time,
Sit side by side, full-sum'd in all their powers,
Dispensing harvest, sowing the To-be,
Self-reverent each and reverencing each,
Distinct in individualities,
But like each other even as those who love.
Then comes the statelier Eden back to men."

---

ceased; far, very far, is Denver from peace; but the young Norse gods have begun to feel rather ashamed of swearing in a lady's presence, and of drawing their knives before a lady's face."—*New America*, p. 100.

APPENDIX.

APPENDIX.

NEW YORK CITY.

[See page 18.]

MR. PARTON, in his pamphlet on "The Government of the City of New York," describes the twenty-four Councilmen, a majority of whom were elected as Republicans and Reformers, as follows:

"The twenty-four Councilmen who have provided themselves with such ample assistance at such costly accommodation are mostly very young men—the majority appear to be under thirty. Does the reader remember the pleasant description given by Mr Hawthorne of the sprightly young bar-keeper who rainbows the glittering drink so dexterously from one tumbler to another? That sprightly young bar-keeper might stand as the type of the young men composing this Board. There are respectable men in the body. There are six who have never knowingly cast an improper vote. There is one respectable physician, three lawyers, ten mechanics, and only four who acknowledge to be dealers in liquors. But there is a certain air about most of these young Councilmen which, in the eyes of a New Yorker, stamps them as belonging to what has been styled of late years 'our ruling class'—butcher-boys who have got into politics, bar-keepers who have taken a leading part in primary ward meetings, and young fellows who hang about engine-houses and billiard-rooms. A stranger would naturally expect to find in such a Board men who have shown ability and acquired distinction in private business. We say again that there *are* honest and estimable men in the body; but we also assert that there

is not an individual in it who has attained any considerable rank in the vocation which he professes. If we were to print the list here, not a name would be generally recognized. Honest Christopher Pullman, for example, who leads the honest minority of six that vainly oppose every scheme of plunder, is a young man of twenty-seven, just beginning business as a cabinet-maker. Honest William B. White, another of the six, is the manager of a printing-office. Honest Stephen Roberts is a sturdy smith, who has a shop near the wharf for repairing the iron-work of ships. Morris A. Tyng, another of the honest six, is a young lawyer getting into practice. We make no remark upon these facts, being only desirous to show the business standing of the men to whom the citizens of New York have confided the spending of sundry millions per annum. The majority of this Board are about equal, in point of experience and ability, to the management of an oyster-stand in a market. Such expressions as 'them laws,' 'sot the table,' 'Seventy-first rigment,' and 'them arguments is played out,' may be heard on almost any Monday or Thursday afternoon, between two and three o'clock, in this sumptuous chamber."

If any one wishes to see how these gentlemen manage New York City, we commend him to Mr. Parton's pamphlet. Official peculation was probably never carried before in a popular government to such a gross and unblushing extreme. We quote some instances:

"The total failure of the contract system is a case in point. To check jobbery and favoritism, it was enacted several years ago that all work done for the city, and all commodities supplied to the city, greater in value than $600, should be the subject of contracts, to be awarded, after due notice, to the lowest bidder. The contract system, so far from putting an obstacle in the way of corruption, has furnished facilities for it. We have the sworn testimony before us that it is common for fictitious bids to be sent in, for genuine ones to be bought off, and for parties who are best prepared to do the work required to be kept in ignorance

of the proposals. Large iron contracts, for example, have been awarded before any one of the great iron firms have been aware that such contracts were in the market; and they have been awarded to men who never melted a pound of iron, nor had any means whatever of doing the work. To a pork-butcher was assigned the contract for building a very costly bridge over a wide river; and the difficult work of grading an avenue, hilly and rocky, has been awarded to a politician ignorant of the most rudimental engineering. We have before us a successful bid for supplying the city offices with stationery, in which we find the bidder offering to supply 'blue folio post' at *one cent* per ream; 'magnum bonum pens' at one cent per gross; 'lead pencils' at one cent per dozen; 'English sealing-wax' at one cent per pound; and eighty-three other articles of stationery, at the uniform price of one cent for the usual parcel. This was the 'lowest bid,' and it was of course the one accepted. It appeared, however, when the bill was presented for payment, that the particular kind of paper styled 'blue folio post' had never been called for, nor any considerable quantity of the other articles proposed to be supplied for one cent. No one, strange to say, wanted 'magnum bonum' pens at one cent a gross, but in all the offices the cry had been for 'Perry's extra fine,' at three dollars. Scarcely any one had used 'envelopes letter-size' at one cent per hundred, but there had been countless calls for 'envelopes note-size' at one cent each. Between the paper called 'blue folio post,' at one cent per ream, and the paper called 'foolscap extra ruled,' at $5.50, the difference was too slight to be perceived; but every one had used the foolscap. Of what avail are contracts, when the officials who award them and the other officials who pay the bill, are in league with the contractor to steal the public money?"

* * * * * *

"Such are some of the consequences that have resulted from admitting to the polls unqualified and untaxed men, in a city which catches and retains the worst of the foreign immigration, and where there are seven

foreign-born voters to every five native. In New York we actually see the state of things contemplated by Daniel Webster in his Pittsburg speech, when he asked: 'Who would be safe in any community where political power is in the hands of the many, and property in the hands of the few?' Such an unnatural state of things, be added, could nowhere long exist. Political power in the City of New York is in the hands of seventy-seven thousand foreign voters and fifty-two thousand native voters; while the great bulk of the property of the city is owned by about fifteen thousand persons. Political power in New York simply means the power to steal with impunity the property of those fifteen thousand persons. * * * Although the system of plunder has now been in operation for *sixteen years*, during which the public thieves have stolen not less than *fifty millions of dollars*, not one man of them has ever been punished, nor even made to disgorge.

"The result of all this plunder is that in thirty-six years the rate of taxation in the City and County of New York has increased from two dollars and a half to forty dollars per inhabitant! In 1830, the city was governed for half a million dollars. In 1865, the entire government of the island, including assessments on private property for public improvements, cost more than forty millions of dollars. In 1830, the population of the city was little more than two hundred thousand. It is now about one million. Thus, while the population of the county is five times greater than it was in 1830, the cost of governing it is sixteen times greater. And yet such is the value of the productive property owned by the city—so numerous are the sources of revenue from that property—that able men of business are of the deliberate opinion that a private company could govern, clean, sprinkle, and teach the city by contract, taking as compensation only the fair revenue to be derived from its property. Take one item as an illustration: under the old excise system, the liquor licenses yielded twelve thousand dollars per annum; under the new, they yield one million and a quarter. Take another: the Corporation own more than twenty miles of wharves and water-front, the revenue from which does not keep the wharves in repair; under a proper system, they would yield a million dollars above the cost of repairs."

Mr. Parton believes that the only remedy for the existing corruption is in a restriction of the suffrage; and he estimates that by refusing the right of voting to every man who cannot read English composition of medium difficulty, no fewer than fifteen thousand votes would be excluded in New York City, and the control of the government would be given back to its legitimate owners, the virtuous and industrious portion of the inhabitants. He thinks, moreover, that no man should be allowed to vote at any city or State election who has not paid a direct tax; and that that tax should vary with the whole amount to be raised. This last seems to us a very excellent suggestion. A direct personal tax, ranging from ten to twenty dollars, according to the expenses, and without payment of which no man should vote, would have a most desirable effect in promoting economy and good government.

Mr. Parton says: "The question now occurs: how was it that a city containing so many public-spirited and honorable men fell into the control of a gang of thieves?

"It has all come about in one generation. Within the memory of men still living the affairs both of the city and the State of New York were so well managed that other States and cities were glad to copy their methods of doing public business. The time was when men, after a brilliant career in Congress, regarded it as promotion to be Mayor of the city; when a seat in the city legislature was the coveted reward of a lifetime of honest dealing in private business; when a seat in the State Legislature was the usual first step to the highest places in the national government; when the very ward committees were composed of eminent merchants and lawyers; and when even to serve as secretary to a ward committee was a feather in the cap of a

bank-teller or head book-keeper in a great house of business. In other words, the time was when the city was governed by its natural chiefs—the men who had a divine right to govern. Nay, more: it was once a distinction to be a voter, since none could vote who were not householders. None could vote who had not given their fellow-citizens *some* evidence of an ability to vote understandingly, and *some* indication of a disposition to vote correctly. The particular test selected we do not admire; and all we can say in favor of it is that it was better than none. It did exclude the great mass of ignorance and vice; it did admit the great mass of intelligence and virtue; it did answer the purpose in a respectable degree.

"This system was changed by the Constitutional Convention of 1821, which abolished the household restriction, and admitted to the polls all citizens, native and foreign, except convicted criminals and madmen. Among those who opposed this fatal change was Martin Van Buren; and all the dire consequences of it which he predicted have come upon the city. He said it would utterly corrupt the politics of New York, by giving it over into the hands of ten thousand ignorant or vicious men, whose votes could not be overcome. It would 'drive from the polls all sober-minded people,' from mere despair of effecting any good by voting. It would take away one powerful motive to virtue by abolishing the distinction between voters and non-voters. To be a voter, said Mr. Van Buren, is now 'the proudest and most invaluable attribute of freemen.' It was one of the rewards of industry and self-control. A proud day it was to a young mechanic when he left his new home and his newly-married wife, and walked, for the first time, to the polls to deposit his vote. It stamped him a respectable man. He was thenceforth a full-fledged citizen, one of the masters of the city, the rulers of which were his servants; and they knew it, and treated him accordingly. Mr. Van Buren's remonstrances were not heeded, and the old system was abolished.

"The evil consequences did not immediately appear, because the habit of selecting respectable men for the public service survived the system which had created that habit."

The *New York Police Gazette*, in describing a recent fracas in the Board of Councilmen, during which an inkstand was hurled at the President, who, in return, drew a pistol, thus describes the members:

"Civic and personal dignity have long since been at a melancholy discount in the official consultations of the Board. We speak not now of the business manipulations of the 'ring,' by which the city treasury is systematically and openly plundered under the mask of legislation. These councilmanic practices have become chronic. Municipal robbery has been brought down from the abstractions of more decorous science to an absolutely practical utilitarian art, and raids have come to be as regularly made upon the metropolitan funds as ordinances come up before the 'City Fathers' for legislative deliberation. These operations have become patent to the most careless observer, and are conducted with such reckless grossness as to excite neither curiosity or surprise. We say we speak not of these things, but we speak rather of that burlesque on all legislative qualifications, more recently presented by the intellectual and moral developments of our eminent Board of Councilmen.

"A casual glance at the general position and form of attitudinizing of our junior board of legislators, when in grave deliberation, is quite sufficient to settle their spiritual status. The perfect *abandon* of posture there visible would inflame the genius of a landscape artist. The heavily-loaded faces, the not less heavy brown lines, describing a curvature from the corner of their mouths to the centre of their lips, and expressing a confidential familiarity with the salivary essence of the

best of old Virginia's staple, the well-stored lumbar regions and the obese physiognomies in general that there present themselves, would together form a group for which it would be difficult for the most accomplished painter to find a suitable center-piece. Discharges of the genuine elixir of the first quality of the fine-cut narcotic are in 'the full tide of successful experiment' on every side, and one can scarcely glance in any direction without encountering the bold demonstrations of a genuine 'scientific squirt.' The comfortably folded nether limbs of the legislators, sometimes elevated to an angle of several degrees with their heads, intensifies immeasurably the attractiveness of the general scene, and when to this we add their collective muddled intelligence, gravely fumbling over documents whose subject they cannot comprehend, and repeating language they cannot define or even spell, one would suppose the *ne plus ultra* of legislative absurdity had been finally reached."

The *New York Tribune* recently said, in support of the endeavor to take the management of the Public Schools out of the hands of the citizens of New York:

"It is a matter of the first importance that the management of our educational institutions should be in the hands of men of respectable position in society and unexceptionable character. How far this condition has been complied with will be seen from the fact that, of the present school commissioners and trustees of this city, *eight are liquor-dealers, while the names of no fewer than seventeen are not to be found in the City Directory.*"

THE ANTI-OFFSPRING MOVEMENT.

[See page 60.]

This is proved by the extent to which the anti-offspring practice has been carried in New England, and wherever New England ideas prevail. It is the esoteric, the interior doctrine of the Woman's Rights' movement. These female reformers see that if they are to act the part of men in the world, they must not be burdened with the care of young children. So they have resolved to marry, but to limit, in certain ways well understood in France, the number of their offspring. Dr. Allen, of Lowell, Massachusetts, contends that the Yankee race is getting run out of New England. In 1860 the foreign population (206,106) produced nearly one thousand more children than the entire American population (970,960) of Massachusetts. It is probable that the proportion of those who are of the marriageable ages is greater among the foreign born. But, even if we suppose this to be the case, the disproportion in births must be very great. The American births are actually less than the American deaths, and the size of American families is becoming small by degrees and unbeautifully less with every generation. Dr. Allen tells us that in one town the first generation averaged 9·50 children to a family; the second, 7·31; the third, 7·69; the fourth, 7·25; the fifth, 4·90; the sixth, 2·84. In all the towns examined the first settlers on an average had in each family from eight to ten children; the three succeeding generations ranged from seven to eight to each family, the fifth about five, while the sixth decreased to less than three. It is surprising how many large families were once found in those old towns. In one small town, settled in 1655, the records attest that there were 26 families with 10 children each, 29 families with 11 children each, 24 families with 12 children each, 13 families with 13 children each, 1 family with 15, and 1—the crown of all—with 21 children. Eighty-five families in those old times

could show 272 children—a juvenile regiment. "Then," says the doctor, with something of a pathetic lament over a decaying generation, "large families were common—now the exception; then it was rare to find married people having only one, two, or three children—now it is very common. Then it was regarded as a calamity for a married couple to have no children—now such calamities are found on every side of us; in fact they are fashionable." If this state of things continues, Dr. Allen thinks that the foreign element will rapidly obtain a numerical superiority in the Commonwealth, and, as universal suffrage is the rule, the political also.

We may add that this limitation of offspring is not only practised by those whose limited means might render it excusable, but by the wealthier classes. In fact, the foreigners, who increase as rapidly as they can, are much poorer than the native citizens. But, in proportion as Woman's Rights' ideas prevail, are parents becoming ashamed of large families. It is not that the New England women are unable to bear as many children as formerly, but that they will not.

From the New York Independent (Radical).

ROOM HIGHER UP.

[See page 77.]

It is said of Daniel Webster that when a young lawyer was expressing to him some solicitude at the crowded appearance of the profession, he comforted the beginner by the assurance that there was "always room higher up." That is, while there was always an overplus of poor lawyers, there never were too many good ones.

The saying is applicable to all the occupations of men, and still more so to those of women. While deploring the injustice often shown to women in the matter of pay, it is important for every young girl to remember that the better she qualifies herself, and the higher she gets, the less inequality she will encounter. In the highest walks there is no inequality at all. Among authors, artists, musicians, lecturers, and the like, there is absolutely no difference between the pay of a man and of a woman—at least, above a certain grade. If there is, it is likely to be in the woman's favor.

Thus, Mrs. Stowe was at one time paid more per page than any writer of the "Atlantic" staff. Anna Dickinson probably averages more compensation per lecture than any man now in the field. Ristori is certainly paid more than any male actor. Rosa Bonheur and Harriet Hosmer probably obtain higher prices for their works than if they were men; certainly not less high. And these professions are not yet filled, and show no signs of being filled by women. There is a positive dearth of first-class female writers for our magazines; very few women who can write a good story, for instance, even if sure of receiving fifty or a hundred dollars for it. It is equally hard to find in our cities a good female vocalist, who will sing at a concert of the highest character for fifty dollars a night. There are plenty of poor candidates in these occupations, but few good ones.

The Independent published, a few weeks since, an "Appeal of a Western Woman" against the unjust inequalities in the payment of teachers. Yet the same truth applies in this direction also. There is room "higher up." Every school committee-man knows that, while there is always a flood of applications to teach primary schools, the competition rapidly diminishes as the grade ascends; while to obtain a good high-school teacher, who can take classes in Latin and French, is exceedingly hard. As to Greek, it is hardly to be thought of. If in Burlington, Iowa, out of sixteen lady teachers, there are "a number" who can "read a page of Latin, Greek, or Hebrew, as readily as Prof. Tayler Lewis himself," it must be a city unique in America.

At any rate, the case is very different in the Atlantic States. In our schools all the European traditions as to women's culture have been reversed. It is very common to find women who are superior mathematicians, though it used to be thought that women were denied that faculty. But it is very rare to find American-bred girls who are good linguists, whether as to ancient or modern tongues. Of those who seek places as teachers the French accent is usually very bad, while the knowledge of Latin is of the most shallow and superficial kind. French must, therefore, be taught by a foreigner and Latin by a man.

For these reasons the pay of assistants in our high schools is steadily ascending, and it is hard to get a good one, at any price, in the language department. We know of a committee which recently advertised for such a teacher in a New England city. Out of half a dozen applicants, only one proved at all competent. She was engaged at a salary of $750, which was soon raised, at her request, to $900. At that time there were three male teachers employed by the city. All had families to support; all had far severer duties than hers; yet two out of the three had salaries less than hers. And this is only a specimen of what is going on all over New England. It is hard to tell what becomes of the really well-educated girls; it is certainly hard to get them for teachers in the high schools.

One more instance, and we have done. Thousands of women are now employed as type-setters, a trade which has been open to them for thirty years. Yet it is very rare to find among these a good proof-reader. It is a work commanding far higher pay, and demanding more thorough education, and a more accurate habit of mind. We know of one of the largest book-printing establishments in the country, famous all over the land, where the proprietors had tried in vain to find a really good proof-reader among their workwomen. They had almost given it up in despair, when a young lady of remarkably thorough and accurate education was recommended to them. She soon learned the business, and now receives as high wages as any man in their employ.

We have not now space to go into the causes of this difficulty in getting first-class work from women. Some of the same difficulties lie in the way of obtaining it from men also. Then there is the absence or inferiority of collegiate education for women; and the low pay in the lower stages, which no doubt discourages many. A greater drawback than any of these, in our judgment, is the fact that all young men, preparing themselves for any avocation, expect to make it a means of support for life, and have therefore more inducement to thorough preparation than women, who only expect to make their own living in case of need, or until matrimony gives them other duties. In that invaluable but little-known book, "Virginia Penny's Cyclopædia of the Employments of American Women" (Boston: Walker, Wise & Co.), this fact constantly appears, among her masses of statistics of all avocations. A young man *must* learn his business and stick to it, a woman *may*—that is the great difference.

"THE MARRIED WOMEN'S ACTS."

[See page 88.]

So general has been the passage of these Acts, that we believe there is scarcely a state in the Union where the principles of the common law have not been relaxed in favor of the right in property of the wife. As a sample of these laws, we will refer to those of the following states:*

NEW YORK.—Every woman possessed at marriage of property, real or personal, or both, or who may acquire property after marriage by gift (other than from

* I have derived this summary from "*Everybody's Lawyer*," published by Mr. John E. Potter, of Philadelphia, and have reason to believe it correct.

her husband), devise, bequest, distribution, or any patent of her own invention, may hold the same, and all rents, profits, and income therefrom, *to her sole and separate use, free from the control of her husband, and from attachment by his creditors.* Such separate estate, or any part of it, *may be sold, conveyed, and devised by her, as if she were unmarried.* All contracts between males and females in view of marriage are binding after marriage. A married woman has no authority to contract debts to be paid at any future time.

PENNSYLVANIA.—Every woman possessed at marriage of property, real or personal, or both, or who may acquire such thereafter, either by gift, heritage, or her own labor, holds the same, and all rents, profits, and income therefrom, *for her own separate property, free from the control of her husband, and from attachment by creditors for his debts.* A wife may dispose of her separate estate by devise or bequest as if she were single. Such will must be executed in the presence of at least two witnesses, of whom the husband cannot be one. If the wife have any separate property, she is responsible for her own debts, and for all debts incurred by authorized agents in her name; also, for all wrongs or injuries done by her to others, as trespasses, defamations, assaults and batteries, and the like. Her property is also liable for all judgments rendered against the husband for debts incurred by her, either before or after marriage, or for injuries to the persons or properties of others; and must first be levied upon before that of the husband can be touched. Where suit is brought for necessaries supplied to the family, *the property of the husband must first be resorted to;* if that is insufficient, the wife's separate property may be taken, provided the wife personally contracted the debt, or the articles furnished were necessary for the support of the family of such husband and wife. The husband cannot sell, mortgage, or in any way incumber the wife's property, without her written consent, acknowledged before a Judge of a Court of Common Pleas.

MASSACHUSETTS.—Every married woman may hold any property granted to her for her separate use without the intervention of a trustee; and such property is free from liability for her husband's debts, and also from his control, if the deed or will conveying or devising such property is recorded within ninety days in the office for Registry of Deeds for the county where the husband resides, or, if he be not a resident of the State, for the county where the grantor or devisor resides or resided. Such separate property, in order to be free from creditors of the husband, must be invested in public stocks, real estate, personal securities, or household furniture in actual use by her; if invested in trade or commerce, it is not exempt. The wife may devise her separate estate, but the husband must indorse his consent thereto upon the will, unless it is all devised to him. A will of the wife's separate estate may, at any time, be revoked by her, without the husband's consent.

NEW HAMPSHIRE.—Every woman possessed in her own right at marriage of property, real or personal, *may hold the same to her separate use; may lease, sell, bequeath by will, or otherwise dispose of the same as if she were unmarried;* nor is the same liable for the debts of the husband. A married woman, so possessed of property, may prosecute a suit at law in relation thereto for her own benefit in her own name. If a married woman die, leaving no will, her property, real and personal, descends to her heirs, as if she were single.

TENNESSEE.—The separate estate of a wife is exempt from attachment by the husband's creditors, during her lifetime. The same, or any part of it, cannot be sold by the husband without her consent and signature. If the husband die, leaving no children, the wife is entitled to all the real estate, after payment of debts, to dispose of as she may think proper.

ALABAMA.—The real and personal estate of a woman at marriage, together with all that she may thereafter acquire by gift, devise, inheritance, or purchase, with her separate estate, *remains her individual property,*

free from all liability for her husband's debts. The husband is a mere trustee of her property. He may use the rents and profits—not the principal of the estate—without liability to account to the wife for the same. No part of the wife's personal estate can be sold, except with her consent and signature. Both are jointly liable for all goods supplied for the family, by order of either.

INDIANA.—All property owned by the wife at the time of marriage, and all that she may thereafter fairly acquire by devise, bequest, inheritance, or purchase, and all rents, profits, and income therefrom, *is her separate property, free from liability for debts of the husband.*

IOWA.—All property, real or personal, owned by the wife at time of marriage, or afterward acquired by her, *is her separate estate*, exempt from all liability for the debts of the husband. A conveyance of the property of either must be by their joint deed. The husband acts as trustee of the wife's property, and may control and use the rents, issues, and profits thereof during her lifetime. All property accumulated during marriage, except by gift, bequest, or descent, *is owned by both in common.* For debts for family necessaries, *the property of the husband must first be exhausted*, before levying upon that of the wife.

MISSISSIPPI.—All property, real and personal, owned by a woman at marriage or acquired afterward, *is her separate property*, exempt from all liability for the debts of the husband.

CALIFORNIA.—All property, real and personal, belonging to the wife at time of marriage, together with all she may acquire, *remains her separate estate.* Any married woman may carry on business in her own name. At the death of husband or wife, the survivor takes one-half of the common property (that is, property acquired by both, except by gift, bequest, or inheritance), and the other goes to the descendants of the deceased; if there are no descendants, the survivor takes the whole.

RHODE ISLAND.—Every woman possessed at m
riage of property in her own right, or who may acqui
property during marriage, by devise, bequest, or
bution, holds the same to her separate use, exempt fro
liability for the debts of her husband, both during h
lifetime, and after his death.

WISCONSIN.—All property owned by a wo at
riage, or afterward acquired, and all r s,
profits, is *her separate property*—and convey
dispose of, or bequeath the same as if unma
ried. Such property is liable *only for cont*
by her previous to marriage.

The foregoing instances will furnish a general id
the laws of the various States relative to the rig s o
married women in respect to holding separate prop y

The husband in these States is still bound, as of o
to maintain the wife—the failure to afford her a pro
maintenance being sufficient cause of itself for a divor
in at least ten, and probably more States.

He also, in case of a legal separation, is liable to the payment of a regular sum for her support.

If the principle of simple equality of rights, according to the "radical" ideas, was to obtain in our laws, the husband would be no more bound to furnish a maintenance for the wife, than the wife for the husband.

And in case of a legal separation or divorce, the husband would not, as he is now, be liable to the payment of alimony.*

The old or common law, in vesting the property of the wife in the husband by the mere act of marriage, was thus consistent with itself in enforcing the support of the wife thereafter by the husband. We, in these milder days, have divested the husband of his old privilege, while still holding him liable to his old duty. I am not finding fault with this—I am only stating it; to prove that whatever other men may do, we American

* The Baron von Glahn, a German nobleman of Chicago, has recently been required by the Illinois courts to pay his divorced wife alimony to the amount of $28,000.

men are disposed to deal not only justly, but generously toward woman.

No one can deny that if the "woman's rights'" view of the equality of the sexes was carried out, every law on our statute books rendering the husband responsible for the proper maintenance of his wife, according to his means, would be repealed; no difference would be made between the obligations of the two in this respect.

Moreover, so far as the support of children was concerned, the husband and wife would be equally liable. Now, the husband is mainly liable. Even in cases where the wife has a large separate property, the husband's property must generally first be exhausted before the wife's can be touched.

THE LEGISLATURE OF PENNSYLVANIA.

From the Philadelphia Inquirer (Republican) of May 29th, 1867.

Statement of a Reporter—How Laws were Passed—"Smelling Committees"—Is the Legislature a Deliberative Body?

PHILADELPHIA, MAY 27, 1867.

EDS. PHILADA. INQUIRER:—Since the adjournment of the session of the Pennsylvania Legislature of 1867, the public press has denounced it as venal and corrupt.

To the astonishment of the people, it appears that laws were privately enacted, of which no notice was taken in the newspapers of the day at the time of their passage. To the equal astonishment of some members of the Legislature, laws were made, of which *they* knew absolutely nothing until long after the adjournment.

These things seem to require an explanation. As the agent of a newspaper at Harrisburg during the session, allow me to make that explanation in distinct and explicit terms. It has never been so opportune as at the present time, when honorable men throughout the State are endeavoring to find a remedy for legislative corruption.

The session of 1867 opened without the discussion of any measure of particular importance, except the Free Railroad law. No rival corporations were in the field to urge "special" legislation. Every appearance indicated a dull winter.

If it be true that many members had spent large sums in securing their nomination and election, their prospects at that time of obtaining a return must have looked gloomy. Yet one recourse appeared to be left. If the people would not seek the law-makers, the law-makers could seek the people.

Forthwith ingenious men devised a plausible system of *making* business. They appointed committees with varied powers. In jocular legislative circles they were called "smelling committees." The ostensible object of their appointment was always "to ascertain if such or such evil existed, with power to send for persons and papers, and to report, etc." Armed with this authority, they went out into the State from Erie to the Delaware. They investigated the greatest variety of subjects, from the private books of a well-known capitalist to the price of oil on Sugar creek. To prominent railroad managers they came like hawks upon a brood of chickens. Each committee resolved itself into one great mark of interrogation, and placed its formidable "why, how, when, and where" before the victim, who tremblingly obeyed its demands as the great seal of the Commonwealth, with "Virtue, Liberty, and Independence" blazoned upon it, was thrust before his eyes. These peregrinating, investigating, fragmentary, legislative excursionists had all of their expenses paid by the State. What good thing did they do?

If they were really appointed for any legitimate purpose, *they never once achieved it.* If they found any evil it still exists, for *in no single case did they ever remedy it.* If they were designed to secure good legis-

lation on any subject, *they never succeeded in the effort.* They were of no possible use to the people, whatever benefit may have accrued to the committees.

This was one form of legislation that was more than equivocal. There was another equally bad, if not worse. Many members became speculators. Although originally sent by the people, to enact equal laws for all, they no sooner took their seats than they devised special bills, with their own friends, relatives and acquaintances named therein as incorporators. These bills were for many purposes, from the establishment of gold and silver mining companies, without enough land to bury a gold dollar, to the construction of immense railroads, without enough capital to buy one rail. The legislators of a great Commonwealth thus became law jobbers, with a stock on hand of charters to accommodate the market. It can readily be perceived that an act in which perhaps a dozen members were interested, was almost certain to be successfully passed. Not unfrequently these speculative laws (whether intrinsically or not) interfered with the vested rights of other parties, and became injurious to enterprises in which honorable men had expended years of toil and large amounts of money.

These two illustrations of the committee system and the charter system are intended to give a correct idea of the general morality of the session of 1867, and these illustrations lead to a point about which the people know little or nothing, viz.:—The *manner* in which laws were made.

In mercantile business, a man who signs a promissory note which binds his property, without first reading it, is adjudged to be an idiot. In ordinary social life, a man who indorses an agreement without knowing its contents, is esteemed a knave or a madman. *Yet the legislators of* 1867 *actually passed laws at the rate of thirty to the hour, without reading them except by their titles.* To appreciate the enormity of this transaction it must be remembered that these laws were to govern the widow and the orphan, the beggar and the capitalist, men of all religious creeds, business, interests and connections. A solemn duty, that of protecting the citizen in every right that humanity holds dear, thus degenerated into a farce. Day after day, whole pages of printed titles were enacted into laws, without the contents of the bills being read!

But this farce was rendered even more ridiculous. To give a color of deliberation to the transaction, it was required in some cases that the person representing the Legislative District to which the bill (by its title) was *supposed* to refer should say, "All right!" Whereupon it passed. An immense majority thus delegated to some one man the exercise of all their own duty, ability and judgment. Happy era of Arcadian simplicity, when such confidence exists among men in high position, and when the utterance of just two words, by just one man, will give to a half dozen pages of unknown manuscript the majesty of a law, representing the will and controlling the actions of millions of people! Sarcastic, indeed, was the remark of a member of the house, that it would save time to pass the bills by their *numbers*, without the trouble of reading the titles.

This system produced its unavoidable results. Members, officers, and reporters became entangled in the maze. Nobody knew exactly what bills had passed, or what ones had fallen. The duty of the speakers and officers was merely executive, and they had neither the power or ability to resist the wishes of a majority which seemed determined to transform a deliberate body into a machine for turning out laws with lightning rapidity. To trace particular bills, and ascertain their exact condition was the labor of hours. They were numbered by thousands, and it was not uncommon for more than one hundred new ones, in rough manuscript, to be introduced at a single night session. At odd times, on the special request of some member, one or more of these would be considered and hurriedly passed, no particular interest being manifested by any one in the provisions of the new law. Amendments were piled upon amendments, and in one case, eight new sections were offered to a bill as a single amendment.

Not unfrequently after some apparently trifling bill

had been printed for weeks, it would be modified two or three minutes before its passage by the substitution of an entirely new bill, with new provisions. It was quite common for a measure which had passed one house in a harmless shape, to have some objectionable amendment quietly attached to it in the other branch. The English language was tortured to supply apparently harmless phrases which could afterward be construed so as to confer immense powers. In one case a local corporation, nominally to operate in a little township, came very near being transformed into a mammoth organization, by adding the words "and elsewhere." In another case, under cover of a city railroad in a Western village, was concealed a project to build a steam railroad anywhere in the State. The members of the Legislature of 1867 unquestionably knew that such practices were common at the very time they allowed bills to be passed by their title, under the "*all right*" system; yet they took no warning.

This is the way that laws were made at Harrisburg, and this is the reason why many bills escaped the attention, not only of interested parties, but of the newspaper press, at the time of their passage. Does any man wonder at it?

This communication leaves much *unsaid*. Personalities are not needed to prove the effects of a bad system; but if any member feels aggrieved, let him ask himself whether the statements herein made are not literally true. Unless there is a reform, he and his pet projects may next year fall victims to the evil that he now indorses. The people have a right to the better administration of legislative power. To obtain this, it does not necessarily follow that they need cast away men of any particular party or class, but only select from the candidates those who have shown themselves worthy of the trust. A *few* such men were at Harrisburg last winter, but they were not in the majority. Such men should be cherished as tender flowers, whose purity has enabled them to bloom in a garden where good things generally die young.

REPORTER.

3 2044 058

The borrower must return this item on or before the last date stamped below. If another user places a recall for this item, the borrower will be notified of the need for an earlier return.

*Non-receipt of overdue notices does **not** exempt the borrower from overdue fines.*

Harvard College Widener Library
Cambridge, MA 02138 617-495-2413

WIDENER
APR 17 2003
WIDENER
APR 15 2003
CANCELLED
BOOK DUE

Please handle with care.
Thank you for helping to preserve library collections at Harvard.